LECTURES

ON

Repentance, Sanctification and Good Works

(*A Revision of the Lectures LV.-LVII. of Dabney's Theology*)

BY

THOS. C. JOHNSON

BT75
.D235
1930

THE LIBRARY
Union Theological Seminary
RICHMOND, VA.

SPENCE LIBRARY
Union Theological Seminary
RICHMOND, VA.
RS
33
J69

REPENTANCE

SYLLABUS

I. The Words Used in the Original Scriptures to Express It; and the Words Often Translated as if Synonymous.

R. L. Dabney: Syllabus and Notes of Theology, Lecture 55.
John A. Broadus: Commentary on Matthew, on passages cited from Matthew.
A. A. Hodge: Outlines of Theology, Chapter 32.
W. T. G. Shedd: Theology, Vol. 2, pp. 534-535.
A. H. Strong: Outlines of Theology, pp. 220-221.
John Dick: Theology, Lecture 70.
Thayer: Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament.

II. The Statements of the Doctrine of Repentance Unto Life Set Forth in Our Standards. Their Propriety. The Psychological Statement of the Change.

R. L. Dabney, *ibidem.*
A. A. Hodge: Commentary on the Confession of Faith, Chap. XV.
W. T. G. Shedd: Theology, Vol. 2, p. 535.
A. H. Strong: Outlines of Theology, pp. 220-221.
W. A. Brown: Christian Theology in Outline, pp. 390 *et seq.*
The Westminster Standards.

III. What Is "Legal Repentance?" How are "Legal" and "Evangelical Repentance" Related to Repentance Unto Life and to One Another? And of What Should We Repent? And How Long Should We Continue the Exercise?

R. L. Dabney, *ibidem.*
A. A. Hodge: Outlines of Theology, p. 489.
Buck: Theological Dictionary.
A Standard Bible Dictionary.

Fallows: The Popular and Critical Encyclopedia.
Ridgley: Divinity Question, p. 76.
Calvin: Institutes, Book III, Chap. 3.

IV. Who is the Author of Repentance? And Does It Follow or Precede Regeneration?

R. L. Dabney, *ibidem.*
Ridgley: Divinity Question, p. 76.
Watson: Theological Institutes, Chap. 24, Sec. 1.
A. H. Strong: Outlines of Theology, p. 221.
W. N. Clarke: An Outline of Theology, pp. 401-402.
W. A. Brown: Christian Theology in Outline, pp. 390, ff.
Theodore Haering: The Christian Faith; A System of Dogmatics, pp. 644-650.
The Confessions of Faith, Chap. 15.

V. What Are the Relations of Faith and Repentance? Of Faith and Repentance to Regeneration? Of Faith and Repentance to Conversion? Of Repentance to Justification?

R. L. Dabney, *ibidem.*
Calvin, *ibidem.*
Watson, *ibidem.* . .
A. A. Hodge: Commentary on the Confession of Faith, p. 292.
A. A. Hodge: Outlines of Theology, p. 489.
W. G. T. Shedd: Dogmatic Theology, II, pp. 536-537.
A. H. Strong, *ibidem.*
Theodore Haering, *ibidem.*

VI. State and Refute the Opinions of Socinians, the Advocates of the Moral Influence Theory of the Atonement and Rationalists Generally, as to Whether Repentance is a Ground of Justification.

R. L. Dabney, *ibidem.*
Calvin: Institutes, Book III, Chap. 4.
Dick: Lecture 70.
Watson: Chap. 19.
A. A. Hodge: Commentary of the Confession of Faith, pp. 290-292.

VII. Expound the Romish Doctrine of Penance and Show its Falsity.

A. A. Hodge: Outlines of Theology, pp. 510 *et seq.*
A. A. Hodge: Commentary on the Confession of Faith, p. 291.
A. H. Strong: Outlines of Theology, p. 220.
Cat Rom. Part II, Chap. V, Ques. 12, 13.

VIII. What Are the Evidences and Fruits of Repentance Unto Life?

R. L. Dabney, *ibidem.*
A. H. Strong: Outlines of Theology, p. 221 (b).
A. A. Hodge: Outlines of Theology, pp. 488-491, 5, 8.
Ridgley: Divinity, Ques. 76.
Calvin: Institutes III, Chap. III, Sec. 15.

REPENTANCE UNTO LIFE

I. The Words Used in the Original Scriptures to Express it; and the Words Often Translated as if Synonymous.

1. In the New Testament Greek, the word *μετάνοια* is the one which denotes repentance unto life. This word denotes a change of mind, the word mind being employed in the sense of *disposition, will, or inclination,* as in Rom. 7:25, "With the mind, I myself serve the law of God." And the word regularly used in the sense of *to repent unto life,* is *μετανοιεν* from *νοιέω to perceive, understand, consider;* combined with *μετα to change one's mind, or purpose,* implying a change of feelings, or heart. Since this change of heart, feelings, purpose must express itself, the word practically includes in its meaning *to change correspondingly* the outward life. Now while a change of mind on some subjects involves no grief, and while the word therefore is naturally employed by classic Greek writers for a mere change of judgment at times, it nevertheless, in all moral uses, presupposes and implies grief; and whenever this word is employed in the New Testament (unless we except Heb. 12:7) it is used of the change of mind from sin to holiness—a change which no one will make who does not feel deep sorrow for the sin he has already committed. In all these New Testament uses sorrow is necessarily associated with the word, therefore. This element of its New Testament meaning is shown also by the imagery of passages in which the word is found, e. g., in Luke 10:13, "They had repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes."

The historical meaning of the word *μετανοειν* in the New Testament is to change from sin to holiness with grief for past sins. The one exception seems to be Heb. 12:17, "He saw no place for a change of mind" in his father, where the word *μετάνοια* appears to have no ethical signification, to be used of a mere change of mind. Some have supposed that another exception is in Luke 17:3, 4, "If thy brother sin against thee seven times, and seven times turn again to thee, saying, I repent, thou shalt forgive him." Dr. Dabney well says: "In this case *μεταταvοιείν* is used for the professed repentance of an erring man, and even a very unstable brother, to show that his profession, so long as it is not absolutely discredited by his bad conduct, is to be taken by the judgment of charity as evidence of genuine Christian sorrow, so far as to secure forgiveness. A profession of mere carnal sorrow would not entitle to it."

The New Testament also uses the word *στρεφειν* and its compounds of repentance. Sometimes it unites *μετανοειν* and *επιστρèφειν* in the same exhortation.

The word *μεταμèλεσθαι* occurs in the following passage in the New Testament, Matt. 21:29, 32; 27:3; Rom. 11:29; II Cor. 7:8, 10; and is always translated to *repent,* even in the Revised Version, except in II Cor. 7:8, 10; but is incorrectly so translated. It means *to change one's feeling of care, or concern, to regret,* not *to repent unto life.* This is disputed in regard to Matt. 21:32, "And ye, when ye saw it, did not, *μεταμελὴθητε* that afterwards ye might believe on him." Here, too, the word should be given its ordinary sense—translated *did not feel regret.* Although there are expositors who hold that the word is used here of *repentance unto life,* on the ground that this alone is vitally connected with saving faith, the ordinary meaning of the word makes Christ say something stronger than they have apprehended. Give the word its ordinary meaning: Christ charges upon the obdurate priests such hardness that they felt not even that carnal sorrow which is often a precursor of true repentance and faith. Thus there appears to be no reason for taking the word in this passage in any other than its ordinary sense.* The Revised Version translates the two words *μεταμελèσθαι* and *μετανοειν,* with accurate discrimination in II Cor. 7:8-10: "For though I made you sorry with my epistle, I do not regret it: though I did regret it (for I see that that epistle made you sorry, though for a season), I now rejoice, not that ye were made sorry, but that ye were made sorry after a godly sort, that ye might suffer loss by us in nothing. For godly sorrow worketh repentance unto salvation, a re-

*See Broadus: Commentary on Matthew *in loco.*

pentance which bringeth no regret." Paul was too discriminating to intimate that true repentance can ever, by any possibility, be the subject of repentance, though the necessity of giving them sorrow might be regretted.

2. In the Old Testament שוב is the word which in its religious uses corresponds to *μετανοειν*. It is the great word with the prophets and emphasizes the element of turning from sin unto God. It is rather remarkable that they do not use either תשובה or משובה of repentance. משובה is used by them in the sense of *revolt, turning away* from the Lord.

The Old Testament uses נחם in the sense of repent, at times, and, at times, in the sense of regret. When this word is used, the stress seems to be on the element of grief.

It thus appears that the New Testament exhortation *to repent unto life,* in gist, is the same as that of the prophets, e. g., Joel 2:12, 13; Isa. 56:7; Ezek. 33:11, 15. But the New Testament term *μετανοειν*, rendered repent, is more specific. It denotes the inward change of the whole man with reference to sin and God, and conveys, by implication, the idea of grief for past sin, and, by inference, that of the reform of the outward life.

Great difficulty has been found in translating *μετανοειν* into other languages. The Latin versions endeavored to translate it by *poenitentiam agere.* But the word poenitentia is on the same stem with *poena, penalty.* The etymology of the word suggested that *poenitentiam agere* involved the idea of paying the penalty. Hence naturally the Latin Church of the later Papistic and Middle ages slid into the error known as penance. Lactantius proposed a much better word by which to translate *μεταυοειν*, viz. *resipiscentia;* but his suggestion did not carry.

3. Our English word repent is of the same derivation; and it is regrettable that we have not a word with a better origin and history by which to translate *μετανοειν.* It is more to be regretted, however, that our English versions have not universally rendered *μετανοειν* and *μεταμελεσθαι* with discrimination, instead of at times confusing their meanings.

4. So far we have seen that the New Testament in English teaches of a repentance, which is a change of mind, purpose, feeling, heart—from sin to God, a change accompanied by grief for past sin and hatred of it; and that it teaches also of a "repentance," which, according to the Greek, it should call *"regret"*—a pain naturally consequent on sin, arising in the natural heart, either with or without the common con-

vincing operations of the Holy Spirit. This regret contains three elements: fear of the danger incurred, shame of the sin, and remorse, or involuntary self-condemnation before the bar of conscience. It is a purely natural emotion, an emotion of the moral nature, implying a conscience, but compatible with an entire preference of the will for sin. It wants utterly the three elements of true repentance, viz., that of turning from sin unto God, grief for and hatred of sin *as contrary to the holy nature and righteous law of God* and endeavor after obedience. The phenomenon of moral *regret* and the phenomenon of repentance are indeed to be compared only in their occasions, and in their subjective springs. The occasion of each is sin. *The springs* of *Regret* are: (1) an apprehension that the soul that sinneth shall die, (2) an apprehension that sin is nasty and mean, and (3) an apprehension of our culpability. *The springs of repentance* are: (1) an apprehension in the light of God's mercy that the soul that sinneth shall die, (2) an apprehension of the loathsomeness and heinousness of sin as contrary to the holy nature and righteous law of God, and a personal loathing of it and grief for it, (3) a condemnation of conscience, reinforced by a genuine hatred of sin and admiration of God's holiness. Repentance and regret should be sharply distinguished, constantly distinguished.

II. The Statement of the Doctrine of Repentance Unto Life Set Forth in Our Standards. Their Propriety. The Psychological Statement of the Change.

1. "Repentance unto life," says the Shorter Catechism, is a saving grace, "whereby a sinner, out of a true sense of his sin, and apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ, doth, with grief and hatred of his sin, turn from it unto God with full purpose of and endeavor after new obedience." (Shorter Catechism, Ques. 87.) "By it a sinner out of the sight and sense not only of the danger, but also of the filth and odiousness of sins, as contrary to the holy nature and righteous law of God, and upon apprehension of his mercy in Christ to such as are penitent, so grieves for and hates his sins as to turn from them all unto God, purposing and endeavoring to walk with him in all the ways of his commandments," says the *Confession of Faith,* XV :2.

According to these statements repentance consists of: (1) grief for and hatred of our sins (Ps. 119:128, "I hate every false way," 119:136, "Streams of water run down mine eyes because they keep not thy law"), (2) an actual turning unto God from all sin, and (3) a sincere and persevering endeavor after new obedience (Acts 26:20, "That they should repent and turn to God and do works meet for repentance").

According to the same statements the subjective springs of repentance are: (1) a consciousness of the guilt of sin, i. e., of exposure to merited punishment for it, which the justice of God demands (Ps. 51:4, 9, "Against thee, thee only have I sinned, and done that which is evil in thy sight: That thou mayst be justified when thou speakest and be clear when thou judgest." "Hide thy face from my sins and blot out all mine iniquities"), (2) a consciousness of pollution as opposed to the holiness of God (Ps. 51:5, 7, 10, "Behold I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me," "Purify me with hyssop and I shall be clean, wash me and I shall be whiter than snow," "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me"), (3) a consciousness of helplessness (Ps. 51:11, "Cast me not away from thy presence and take not thy Holy Spirit from me"); and a bright apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ (Ps. 51:1).

2. The propriety of these doctrinal statements is manifest from the study just made of the words used in the original Scriptures to express repentance and from the Scriptures cited in connection with the analysis of the statements: but it may be well to adduce further proof that an apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ is essential to evangelical repentance. Faith in Christ is a necessary motive to evangelical repentance: (1) "Because the awakened conscience echoes God's law and can be appeased by no less a propitiation than that demanded by divine justice itself, and until this is realized by application to Christ, either indifference must stupefy, or remorse must torment the soul." (2) "A sense of the amazing goodness of God to us in the gift of his Son, and of our ungrateful requital of it is necessary to excite in the repentant soul the proper shame and sorrow for sin as committed against God (Ps. 51:14)." (3) "This is proved by the teachings and examples furnished in Scripture," Ps. 51:1; 130:4, "There is forgiveness with thee that thou mayst be feared."

3. It has become clear that in repentance there is a threefold change of the soul: (1) a change of view—an intellectual change—so that sin is recognized as involving guilt, defilement, and helplessness (Ps. 51:3, "I know my transgression and my sin is ever before me"), (2) a change of feeling—an emotional change—so that there is grief for sin as opposed to the goodness, justice and holiness of God (Ps. 51:1, 2), and (3) a change of purpose—a voluntary change—a turning from sin to God in quest of pardon and cleansing (Ps. 51:7, "Purify me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; wash me and I shall be whiter than snow." Repentance is, therefore, a change of the whole man.

III. What is "Legal Repentance?" How Are "Legal" and "Evangelical" Repentance Related to "Repentance Unto Life?" And to One Another? And of What Should We Repent? And How Long Should We Continue the Exercise?

1. "Legal Repentance" has been described by some theologians as flowing only from a sense of danger and fear of wrath, from unbelief, from an aversion to God and His holy law, ordinarily from discouragement and despondency, "as temporary, and as producing only partial and external reformation."* When so defined it is only another name for what we have called regret.

Other theologians (and among them Dr. R. L. Dabney) describe *legal repentance* as "a genuine sorrow for sin, including both fear of its dangers and consciousness of its wrongness, and loathing of its odiousness, with a thorough justifying and approving of God's holy law; a sorrow wrought by the Holy Ghost, but wrought by him only through the instrumentality of the Convincing Law and unaccompanied with conscious hopes of Mercy in Christ," distinctly apprehended; and a turning from sin unto God with endeavor after compliance with His will. In other words, they mean by Legal Repentance, the genuine repentance wrought by Old Testament instrumentalities—by the instrumentalities of the Legal Dispensation.

By Evangelical Repentance these theologians mean, "that godly sorrow for sin which is wrought by the renewing Spirit, including the acts of Legal Repentance as just described, but also, and chiefly, the tender sorrow combined with hopes of mercy prroceeding from appropriating faith, when the believer 'looks on Him whom he hath peirced,' and sees there at once a blessed way of deliverance, and a new illustration of God's love, and his own aggravated vileness."

This distinction between the true repentance of the Old Testament saint and the New Testament saint we accept as accurate; and shall use the term Legal Repentance of genuine godly repentance of the Old Testament Dispensation.

2. In view of what has just been said it is clear that "Legal Repentance" and "Evangelical Repentance," are related to "Repentance unto Life" and to one another as two co-ordinate species are related to their genus. They are each true forms of repentance unto life. The one was characteristic of the Old Testament ,the other is characteristic of the New Testament Dispensation.

---

*Buck: Theological Dictionary; Ridgley: Divinity, Lecture 76. The Popular and Critical Encyclopedia.

3. The Confession of Faith (Chap. XV, Sec. 5.) says: "Men ought not to content themselves with a general repentance, but it is every man's duty to repent of his particular sins, particularly." So the Scriptures teach in Daniel IX; Nehemiah IX; Ps. 19:13; Luke 19:8; I Tim. 1:13, 15. The larger Catechism (Ques. 76) represents repentance as including turning from all *sins* unto God; and the Shorter Catechism (Ques. 87) represents it as including turning from all *sin* unto God. So the Scriptures teach in Acts 26:18; I Kings 8:47, 48; Acts 2:37; Ps. 51:7. Put together these passages from the Standards bring out the truth: Every man ought to repent of sin as such, of all sins, of particular sins, and of his besetting sins; just as he should strive for virtue as such, for all virtues, for particular virtues, and for those virtues which he is specially deficient in, or stands in special need of (So De Moor). If he is to further his sanctification as he ought he must repent of sins of deed, word, thought, feeling—sins in conduct of every sort—and sins of character. Hence every conscious, and especially every consçious and recent transgression should be made the subject of particular repentance; and with reference to any unconsious or forgotten transgressions, to which we cannot advert by reason of the limitation of our faculties, we should each remember that he has such sins and grieve over the fact that he has them, praying the meanwhile that his vision of the right and the wrong may grow more clear.

The student has seen that in teaching that sin of nature has to be repented of, the Bible teaches that our native depravity—a principal element in original sin—must be repented of; and may ask: must he repent too of the guilt of Adam's first sin. In answer it must be said, that only as he recognizes himself as having been in our first parents in whom the whole human race then was can he repent either of Adam's first sin or its guilt. If he regard himself as sustaining a mere federal relation to Adam he may merely regret that first sin and therefore its guilt.

4. After this description of repentance it is manifest that it is not only an act to be performed at the beginning of conversion but one to be kept up as long as we sin, or are sinful; it should become keener with the growing clarity of view of the heinousness of our sins of act and our sin of nature—a lifelong exercise.

IV. Who is the Author of Repentance? And Does It Follow or Precede Regeneration?

1. In answer to the first of these questions remark:

(a) Were we to confound repentance with regret we might ascribe repentance to the unaided workings of the human heart. The natural man is amply capable of regret.

(b) Were the Pelagian view of human nature correct—that human nature has full power to the good, the spiritually good—we might ascribe repentance to man's own volition exclusively. But the Pelagian view of human nature is superficial and not accordant with fact.

(3) From the nature of repentance itself taken in connection with the native character of man, and from plain Scriptural teaching it is evident that God is the Author of repentance. (a) From the nature of repentance itself, since its subjective springs are: (1) a sense of the odiousness of sin, (b) a sense of the beauty of holiness, and (c) an apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ. It therefore involves faith which is a "fruit of the Spirit." (Gal. 5:22), and "God's gift" (Eph. 2:8). (b) From the plain assertions of Scripture: Acts 5:31, "Him did God exalt with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance to Israel, and remission of sins"; Acts 11:18, "And when they heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then to the Gentiles also hath God granted repentance unto life"; II Tim. 2:25, "In meekness correcting them that oppose themselves; if peradventure God may give them repentance unto the knowledge of the truth"; Zech. 12:10, "And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplication; and they shall look upon him whom they have pierced; and they shall mourn for him as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn"; Ezek. 11:19, "And I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you, and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them a heart of flesh; that they may walk in my statutes and keep mine ordinances"; Jeremiah 31:18, "Turn thou me, and I shall be turned." See also Ps. 80:3, 7, 19; 85:4.

These texts can not be evaded by saying, that God is the author of repentance only mediately—by teaching the Gospel which inculcates and invites to repentance. In some of these texts those who are already possessed of the Gospel means, pray to God to work repentance in them; and in II Tim. 2:25, there is a "peradventure" whether God will give repentance to those to whom Timothy was to give the truth, showing that repentance was a grace, was a separate gift which God might give on occasion of Timothy's giving the Gospel.

Nor can these texts be evaded by the teaching of Theodore Haering, who seems (Theology, pp. 647 *et seq.*) to hold that repentance, which he represents as an element of faith, is mysteriously effected in us by the example of Christ—by his perfect but merely human attitude to God. According to these Scriptures Christ's example can be nothing more than occasion of the gift.

2. The Arminians avow, on the one hand, that repentance is the work of the Holy Ghost, and, on the other, that it is wrought before regeneration, in the order of production, as they also hold concerning faith and justification. Their reasons are two: *First,* that we are taught (Ps. 51:10) to pray for regeneration; but that prayer, to be acceptable, must be sincere; and that a sincere request for a holy heart implies, or presupposes repentance for ungodliness. *Second,* that repentance must be presupposed in faith, since to fly to Christ as a refuge from sin presupposes a sense of sin; that faith is a condition to justification; and that justification must precede regeneration, since God can not be supposed to bestow the beginning of life in Him—communion with Him—the beginning of eternal life—on a rebel as yet unreconciled to Him. They point to the Seventh Chapter of Romans, and say: We have in this chapter up through the 23rd verse a description of repentance; have in verses 24 and 25, an exposition of the dawnings of saving faith; have in Rom. 8:1, first clause, the justification consequent thereon; and 8:1, last clause, an exposition of the beginning of Spiritual life.

These objections are invalid:

1st. The plausibility of each is due for the most part to the oversight of the fact, that the priority of one over another of these several steps, is only that of causation and not of time. Every one who is regenerate is in the same moment, in principle, repentant, believing and justified. Since all are parts of God's grace, is it not foolish to say that His righteousness or His wrath forbids Him to bestow this before that, since His grace permits neither to precede in time and none to be lacking.

2nd. The objection that a sincere prayer for regeneration can't be made prior to repentance, that we are commanded so to pray, that therefore repentance must be prior to regeneration, is countered by an equally grave objection to their view that repentance precedes regeneration: How can a man prevalently ungodly—totally depraved—exercise genuine repentance, godly sorrow for sin and endeavor after new obedience, and so pray for regeneration, while irregenerate. No true spiritual desire can exist till God has renewed the will. The Arminian should remember that if God must give repentance that he, an irregenerate man, may pray sincerely for a regenerate heart, He must also give regeneration which is necessary that his repentance be no sham.

It should be remarked, too, that the Scriptures on which the Arminian seems to rely for his view that the unregenerate man may make an acceptable prayer for regeneration, Ps. 51:10, is not relevant,

since it is the prayer of a regenerate man. Such David was before he cried: "create in me a clean heart." His prayer was for a renewal. One who has spiritual life in any degree may pray for spiritual life; but not he who is spiritually dead. Yet it is proper for God to command us to pray for spiritual life. We ought to have it. Ability is not the measure of obligation in the spiritual sphere.

3rd. The second objection: that God will not give spiritual life while unreconciled to us—not till we have been justified may be countered by objecting to their scheme: God will not bestow the essential gifts of faith and repentance, to which eternal blessedness is tied by the Gospel, before bestowing life—communion with Him. "Must not the Arminian, just as much as the Calvinist, fall back for his solution of these difficulties, upon the glorious fact, that Christ hath deserved all these saving gifts for his people?" To him who believes the doctrine of unconditional election, there is no difficulty here; because he believes that these saving gifts are all pledged to the believing sinner, not before he fulfills any instrumental conditions, but before he is born. There is no difficulty in it all to God; because all is of grace" (Dabney).

V. What Are the Relations of Faith and Repentance? Of Faith and Repentance to Regeneration? Of Faith and Repentance to Conversion? Of Repentance to Justification?

1. Calvinistic Theologians have divided on the question: which casually precedes, faith or repentance? Calvin and the majority, perhaps, of Calvinistic theologians have maintained that "repentance not only immediately follows faith, but is produced by it." He says again: "When we speak of faith as the origin of repentance, we dream not of any space of time which it employs in producing it; but we intend to signify that a man can not truly devote himself to repentance, unless he knows himself to be of God." He adds that this only becomes known by appropriating faith. Dr. Shedd states and argues the same position in the following words: "Though faith and repentance are inseparable and simultaneous, yet in the order of nature faith precedes repentance." Zech. 12:10, "They shall look on me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him as one mourneth for an only Son." Acts 11:22, "A great number believed and turned unto the Lord." This order is evinced by the following particulars: (a) Faith is the means and repentance is the end. Faith leads to repentance and not repentance to faith. The Scriptures present God's mercy in redemption as the motive to repentance. Jer. 3:14, "Turn, O backsliding children, saith the Lord; for I am married unto you." Joel 2:13, "Turn unto the Lord your God,

for he is gracious and merciful." (b) Repentance involves turning to God; but there can be no turning but through Christ. John 14:6, "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." John 10:9, "I am the door." (c) If repentance precede faith, then it stands between the sinner and Christ. The sinner can not go to Christ "just as he is," but must first make certain that he has repented. (d) If repentance preceded faith, then none but the penitent man is invited to believe in Christ. This contradicts Rom. 5:6, "Christ died for the ungodly." Impenitent sinners are commanded to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, in order to the remission of their sins. (e) The doctrine that repentance precedes faith tends to make repentance legal: that is a reason why Christ should accept the sinner. (f) God out of Christ, and irrespective of faith in Christ, is a consuming fire, Deut. 4:24; Heb. 17:26. It is impossible to have godly sorrow with this view of God. Only remorse and terror are possible. In such passages as Mark 1:15, "Repent ye, and believe the Gospel," and Acts 20:20, "Testifying repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ, the end is mentioned first, and means last. In a proposition, a term may have a position verbally which it has not logically. In Jeremiah 31:34, sanctification is mentioned before pardon. "They shall know me, for I will forgive their iniquity."*

Dr. Dabney, while insisting just as strongly that faith and repentance are chronologically simultaneous, holds that "the very first activity of faith implies some repentance as the prompter thereof"; that "the man begins to believe because he has also begun to repent."

His reasons are: *First,* the other view gives a degrading mercenary character to repentance; as though the sinner selfishly conditioned his willingness to feel aught concerning his sin, on the previous assurance of impunity. It is as though the condemned felon should say: "let me go free, and I will sincerely avow that I have done very wrong. But if I am to swing for it, I will neither acknowledge my guilt, nor say, God bless my country." Is this ingenuous repentance? No; its language always is: (Ps. 57:4, 5) "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight: that thou mightst be justified when thou speakest and be clear when thou judgest. Behold I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me."

"Should sudden vengeance seize my breath,
I must pronounce Thee just in death;
And if my soul is sent to hell,
Thy righteous law approves it well."

---

*Shedd: Dogmatic Theology, II. pp. 536-537.

Second, godly sorrow for sin must be presupposed or implied in the first actings of faith, because faith embraces Christ as Saviour from sin. See Cat. Ques. 86, last clause especially. Surely the Scriptures do not present Christ to our faith only, or even mainly, as a way of impunity. See Matt. 1:21; Acts 3:26, "Unto you first God, having raised up his Servant, sent him to bless you, in turning every one of you from your iniquities"; Tit. 2:14, "Who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquities, and purify unto himself a people for his own possession, zealous of good works." As we have pointed out, the most characteristic defect of a dead faith, is that it would quite heartily embrace Christ as God's provision for immunity in sin; but God offers him to faith for a very different purpose, viz., for restoration to holiness, including immunity from wrath as one of the secondary consequences thereof. But now, a man does not flee from an evil, except as a consequence of feeling it an evil. Hence there can be no embracing Christ with the heart as a whole present Saviour, unless sin be felt in itself a present evil; and there be a genuine desire to avoid it as well as its penalty. * * *

Third, some passages of Scriptures imply this order (that in the order of production, repentance precedes faith); and I am not aware of any which contradict it. Mark 1:15, "Repent ye, and believe the Gospel"; Acts 2:38, "Repent ye and be baptized every one of you for the remission of sins"; Acts 5:31, "Him did God exalt with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance to Israel, and remission of sins"; Acts 20:21, "Testifying repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ"; II. Tim. 2:25, "In meekness correcting them that oppose themselves; if peradventure God may give them repentance unto the knowledge of the truth." Especially this last test implies this order.

These arguments are each inconclusive. To get at the truth, observe: (a) Dr. Dabney and Dr. Shedd, alike, accept the Scriptural definitions of faith and repentance as given in the Westminster standards, e. g., in the Shorter Catechism, Questions 86 and 87; and these definitions inhibit them from concluding that either grace is the necessary logical cause of the other, in a sense which cannot be affirmed of the other. According to these definitions faith has involved in it repentance, and repentance has involved in it faith. According to these definitions each is related to the other as the other to it. They are like Siamese twins. When one comes the other comes; and thy come because of a common parentage. They come like back and front of the head of a child. They are extruded together. They have as their cause (subjective to man) the regenerate nature. When God has touched the soul to life, it functions

in an exercise with two aspects—one of these aspects being faith and the other being repentance. (b) A distinction should be made between incipient faith and incipient repentance, on the one hand, and developing faith and a developing repentance, on the other; for both faith and repentance are lifelong and grow; and in this growth each affects the other causally. A growing repentance opens the mind and heart for expansion of faith and stimulates it, and a growing faith quickens repentance. To a repenting David the mercy of Gad appears more glorious, trust in that mercy is stimulated. To a believing Paul, sins—his own sins—are made to appear more heinous with every new increment to his vision of the grace of God. (c) When we seek the testimony of consciousness as to whether repentance or faith acts first, after the new birth, the answer is decided by the object to which the soul is first directed after the new birth. If the object of its first regenerate look be its own ungodliness, the exercise of repentance is noted first by consciousness; "but just so surely as the volition is potentially, in the preponderating motive, so surely has that soul looked from its ungodliness to Christ, the remedy of it; it may be unconsciously at first, but, in due time, consciously." If, on the other hand, the object of the first regenerate look be Christ, the exercise of faith is noted first by consciousness, but it is a faith which receives Christ as a Saviour from sin. The phenomenon of faith had involved in it an element which consciousness soon distinguishes as repentance.

2. The relation of faith and repentance to regeneration has already been indicated. Regeneration—the consequence subjective to man of God's quickening touch—is that change in his inclinations and propensities which prompts faith and repentance. When the sinner has been regenerated—begotten again—he acts in accord with his new nature. The new nature acts—expresses itself in distinctive exercises and those exercises are faith and repentance. Regeneration is the fountain, spring, or subjective cause of, faith and repentance.

3. Conversion is man's response to God's quickening touch. The relation of faith and repentance to conversion is that of the parts to the whole. Faith and repentance are the converting acts. Conversion is that change of the expression in life corresponding to the change of the nature of the sinner made alive in Christ Jesus.

It is worthy of remark too that "conversion is generally used to designate only the first actings of the new nature at the commencement of a religious life, or the first steps of a return to God after a notable backsliding." Luke 22:32, "I have made supplication for thee that thy faith fail not; and do thou, when once thou hast turned again,

establish thy brethren." Repentance, on the other hand, is a daily experience of the Christian as long as the struggle with sin continues in his heart and life. Ps. 19:12, 13, "Who can discern his errors? Clear thou me from hidden faults. Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins. Let them not have dominion over me. Then shall I be upright and be clear from great transgression." Gal. 5:24, "And they that are of Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with the passions and the lusts thereof." Col. 3:6, ff. "Put to death therefore your members which are upon the earth, et cetera.

4. Repentance is essential to justification ,but not the instrument of justification. The sinner is not justified by repentance, but by faith, which is the embracing act whereby union with Christ is instrumentally effected, and gratuitous salvation becomes sure. That it is necessary in the sense that no one can expect justification without it, is evident from the following facts: (1) The giving of justification to an unrepentant sinner "would be in effect to sanction his sin, to confirm him in his sinful state, and to encourage others therein." (2) Repentance is involved in faith. Faith can not be exercised save as repentance is exercised, any more than repentance be exercised save as faith is exercised. (3) The design of Christ's work is to save his people from their sins. He will not grant justification except to him who hates his sin and turns from it. God must have some practical assurance in the sinner's own appetencies against his going on in sin. This of course does not argue that repentance is atoning, that it is any ground of justification, or that it is the instrument of justification, when considered apart from its element apprehensive of God's mercy in Christ.

VI. State and Refute the Opinion of the Socinians, the Advocates of the Moral Influence Theory of Atonement and Rationalists Generally, as to Whether Repentance is a Ground of Justification.

1. They hold in common that the repentance of the sinner is the only satisfaction which the law requires, and therefore the only condition God demands as the prerequisite to full pardon and restoration to divine favor. They so hold apparently because: (a) Of the obstinate delusion of the carnal mind, under the power of which men often hold that they should be pardoned because they have repented. (b) Of their mistaking God's determination, revealed in the Scripture, that no impenitent person should be pardoned, for quite another thing, viz.: His teaching that repentance is a satisfaction for outraged law. This latter he does not teach.

2. Against this view remark:

(a) *The law* demands perfect and perpetual obedience. Repentance is not obedience.

(b) *Repentance* is no reparation for past disobedience. It, in itself, has no relevancy to repairing the mischiefs the sin has inflicted. Thus men judge. They say to those who have injured them: Your repentance is proper; but it can not recall the past, or undo that which is done.

(c) *Repentance* is grief and hatred of sin, a turning from it unto God with endeavor after new obedience: its language is confession with reference to the past and present—a promise and determination Godward with reference to the future. In part it is a confession of guilt, in part a confession of pollution. A man can not pay the penalty due to his sin—can not free himself of guilt—by confessing it. No man pays a just debt by confessing its justice. Nor can the acknowledgment that that one is polluted as well as guilty cleanse of guilt, or pollution. Nor can good behavior for the future remove that guilt. Were perfect behavior for the future possible it would be no more than what the law required for the future. Now, it is precisely guilt from which the sinner is freed in justification. Hence as no element of repentance frees from guilt, no element of repentance can serve as the ground of justification.

(d) *Repentance* after transgression is a work. Hence justification on the ground of repentance would be justification by works; such a doctrine is rendered impossible by Scripture: Rom. 3:28, "We reckon therefore that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law."

(e) *Repentance* is as much a gift of God (Acts 5:31) as the remission which it is supposed to purchase. This settles the matter unless these Rationalists can show that God has bargained to receive repentance as the ground of pardon—a thing which they will find hard to do.

(f) The Scriptures teach that the believor is justified solely on the ground of the righteousness of Christ imputed to him and received by faith alone; that Christ has rendered a full satisfaction in behalf of all for whom he died.

We maintain therefore that while the impenitent can not be pardoned, that repentance is not the ground of pardon—not that ground even in part.

VII. Expound the Romish Doctrine of Penance; and Show Its Falsity.

Rome substituted for the Scriptural doctrine of repentance unto life a doctrine which she calls *Penance*. She distinguishes penance as

(1) a virtue, which is internal and includes sorrow for sin and a turning from it unto God; and (2) a sacrament which is the external expression of the internal state. She magnifies the sacrament as the one means of recovery from a fall from a state of grace. This sacrament, she teaches, consists of (a) "contrition—i. e., sorrow and detestation of past sins, with a purpose of sinning no more (this is the virtue); (b) confession, or self-accusation to a priest having jurisdiction and the power of the keys; (c) *satisfaction,* or some painful work, imposed by the priest and performed by the penitent, to satisfy divine justice for sins committed; and (d) *absolution,* pronounced by the priest judicially and not merely declaratively. They hold that the element of satisfaction included in this sacrament makes a real satisfaction for sin, and is an efficient cause of pardon, absolutely essential—the only means whereby the pardon of sins committed after baptism can be secured." Rome excludes from contrition (the only element in Penance properly belonging to repentance) all sorrow for sin of nature; and some of her theologians allow *attrition,* or natural regret, to be substituted for *contrition* without the vitiation of the sacrament.

The falsity of this doctrine is evident from the following considerations: *1st.* It is not a sacrament, since it was not instituted by Christ; and since it does not signify, seal, or convey the benefits of Christ; and the new covenant. See Dabney's Theology, p. 753. *2nd.* There is no Scriptural warrant for auricular confession. Scripture knows no special priest in the New Testament dispensation to whom confession can be made. Every true believer in this dispensation is a metaphorical priest. Believers are to confess to one another; and they are to confess everything immediately to God. I Tim. 2:5, "For there is one God and one mediator between God and man—the man Christ Jesus." I John 1:9, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us of all unrighteousness." *3rd.* The doctrine of judicial priestly absolution is at once unscriptural and impious. The power of absolute forgiveness is incommunicable in itself. *4th.* There is no Scriptural support for the element of *satisfaction.* It does dishonor to the one perfect sacrifice offered once for all by our great High Priest. Heb. 10:10-14, "By which will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. * * * *." For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." The distinction between temporal punishment due to sin and eternal punishment due to it, is unwarrantd by God's word. The penalty of sin is God's judicial wrath. While that lasts there is no peace. When it is satisfied there is no more condemnation. Rom. 8:1, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." The temporal sufferings

of believers are not penalties but chastisements. The self-imposed *satisfactions*—painful works of satisfaction—are so much will-worship which God despises. Col. 2:20-23. *5th.* It belittles the element of contrition—the only element which is even of the nature of repentance.

The doctrine is false and pernicious.

VIII. What are the Evidences and Fruits of Repentance Unto Life?

The Scriptures command us "to bring forth fruits worthy of repentance." This fruit includes all holy living. For repentance includes turning unto God with full purpose of, and endeavor after, new obedience; but there are certain acts dictated by repentance—acts which proceed immediately from the attitude of penitence:

1. Sincere repentance must lead to confession. "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh," Prov. 28:13. The highest form of this act is the confession of *all* our sins to God in secret prayer. True repentance will always thus utter itself to Him. The next highest form of this act is, if some of our sins have scandalized the Church, to make public confession of those sins. A third form of the duty is, if a sin of ours has been aimed immediately against our neighbor and if that sin is known to him, to confess it to him. See Luke 18:13, "God be merciful to me, a sinner"; Matt. 5:23, "If thou bring thy gift to the altar and there rememberest that thy brother," et cetera.

2. Sincere repentance must prompt us to make reparation for the damage done by our sin wherever reparation is possible. He who truly repents wishes his sin and its injurious results undone; and if he truly wish it and its consequences undone he will do all in his power to undo them. See Luke 19:8, "If I have wrongfully exacted aught of any man, I restore fourfold unto him."

3. Sincere repentance must also prompt to watchfulness against the recurrance of that sin, and all sins, and to full conformity with all the holy law of God. 2 Cor. 7:11, "For behold, this self same thing, that ye were made sorry after a godly sort, what earnest care it wrought in you, yea what clearing of yourselves, yea what indignation, yea what fear, yea what longing, yea what zeal, yea what avenging."*

My brethren, in leaving this important subject let us lay to heart the words of the Westminster Confession, Chap. XV. 1, "Repentance unto life is an evangelical grace, the doctrine whereof is to be preached by every minister of the gospel, as well as that of faith in Christ."

---

*Read Calvin's Expositions of this passage as given in the Institutes, Book III., Chapter III., Sec. XV.

SANCTIFICATION

SYLLABUS

I. What the Terms of the Original Scriptures Translated by the English Word Sanctify? And What the Senses They Bear in These Scriptures?

R. L. Dabney: Theology, pp. 660-661.
W. G. T. Shedd: Dogmatic Theology II., pp. 553-554.
A. A. Hodge: Outlines of Theology, p. 520.

II. State the Different Views of the Nature of Sanctification, Disproving the False Views; and Proving the True View Correct.

A. A. Hodge: Outlines of Theology, pp. 520-521.
A. H. Strong: Outlines of Systematic Theology, p. 230.
W. G. T. Shedd: Dogmatic Theology II., pp. (554, ff.)
Westminster Shorter Catechism, Question 35.
Westminster Larger Catechism, Question 75.
Westminster Confession of Faith, Chap. XIII.
John Dick: Theology, Lecture 74.
H. A. Boardman: The Higher Life Doctrine of Sanctification Tried by the Word of God.
R. L. Dabney: Theology, pp. 672-674, 674-677.
W. H. Griffith Thomas: Bibliotheca Sacra for July, 1919, pp. 267-288.
Jas. H. McConkey: The Threefold Life.

III. How is Sanctification Distinguished from and How Related to Regeneration and Justification?

R. L. Dabney: Theology, pp. 663-665.
W. G. T. Shedd: Dogmatic Theology II., p. 559.
A. A. Hodge: Outlines of Theology, pp. 521-522.
John Dick: Theology, Lecture 74.
Ridgley: Divinity, Question 78.

IV. What the Subject of Sanctification? Is It the Whole Man—Inclinations, Power of Choice, Power of Intellection and the Body?

R. L. Dabney: Theology, pp. 661-663.
A. H. Strong: Outlines of Systematic Theology, p. 230.

A. A. Hodge: Outlines of Theology, pp. 522-523.
W. G. T. Shedd: Dogmatic Theology II., pp. 554-555.
Brooks: Scriptural Sanctification.

V. Who the Agents? And What the Means of Sanctification? The Outer Means? The Inner Means?

R. L. Dabney: Theology, pp. 665-667.
A. A. Hodge: Outlines of Theology, pp. 523-525.
A. A. Hodge: Commentary on the Confession of Faith, pp. 265 ff.
A. H. Strong: Outlines of Systematic Theology, p. 230 (E), (1).
John Dick: Theology, Lecture 75.
Ridgley: Divinity, Question 75.

VI. Is Sanctification a Duty? What Say Antinomians?

W. G. T. Shedd: Dogmatic Theology II., pp. 555-556.
A. A. Hodge: Outlines of Theology, p. 526.
A. A. Hodge: Commentary on the Confession of Faith, p. 267.
R. L. Dabney: Theology, pp. 685-687.
A. H. Strong: Outlines of Systematic Theology, p. 230.

VII. Is Perfect Sanctification Attainable in This Life?

R. L. Dabney: Theology, pp. 667-674.
A. H. Strong: Outlines of Systematic Theology, pp. 231-232.
Watson: Theological Institutes, Chap. 29.
Ridgley: Divinity, Question 76.
A. A. Hodge: Outlines of Theology, pp. 529-539.
Charles Hodge: Theology, III., pp. 245, ff.
"The Victorious Life," Published, 1918.
H. A. Boardman: The Higher Life.
W. D. Snodgrass: The Scripture Doctrine of Sanctification Stated and Defended against the Error of Perfectionism.
B. B. Warfield in the Princeton Theological Review, Vol. XVI. and Vol. XVII., No. 3, July, 1919, The Victorious Life; No. 1, January, 1919, The Higher Life.
W. H. Griffith Thomas, in the Bibliotheca Sacra, July, 1919: "The Victorious Life."
A. W. Pitzer: The New Life not the Higher Life; or The Believers' Holiness Personal and Progressive.

VIII. What the Standard of Our Sanctification? Show the Value and Relation of Christ's Example Thereto.

R. L. Dabney: Theology, pp. 685-687.
John Dick: Lecture 75.

SANCTIFICATION

I. What the Terms of the Original Scriptures Translated by the English Word Sanctify? And What the Senses They Bear in These Scriptures?

1. In the Old Testament we find the word קדשׁ in the Piel, Hiphil and Hithpail—translated by our word *sanctify*. The kind of sanctification indicated may be any one of four, as the contexts make plain: (1) That of mere separation to a particular purpose and that purpose not a sacred one, as in Jeremiah 22:7, "And I will prepare (sanctify) destroyers against thee, every one with his weapon; and they shall cut down thy choice cedars." (2) That of separation to a sacred use—a separation—of men to the priesthood, of utensils to the temple service, or of the seventh day to be a Sabbath to the Lord. Ex. 28:41, "And thou shall put them upon Aaron thy brother, and upon his sons with him, and shalt anoint them and consecrate them, and sanctify them, that they may minister unto me in the priest's office." Ex. 29:36, "And every day shalt thou offer the bullock of sin offering for atonement, and thou shalt cleanse the altar, when thou makest atonement for it; and thou shalt anoint it, to sanctify it." Deut. 5:12, "Observe the Sabbath day to keep it holy (sanctify it), as Jehovah thy God commanded thee." (3) A separation from ceremonial, or moral, pollution—the most important use of the word. 2 Sam. 11:4, "For she was purified from her uncleanness." Num. 15:40, "That ye may remember and do all my commandments, and be holy (sanctified) unto your God." (4) A separation which God makes of himself in the sight of his people. Ezek. 38:23, "And I will magnify myself and sanctify myself, and I will make myself known in the eyes of many nations."

2. In the New Testament we find the word ἁγιάζειν translated by our word sanctify. The sanctification is of four kinds: (1) That of separation from a common to a sacred use: (a) Spoken of things. Matt. 23:17, "The temple that sanctifieth the gold." (b) Spoken of persons. John 10:36, "Whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world." (2) That of separation from ceremonial or moral pollution: (a) From ceremonial pollution. Heb. 9:13, "For if the blood of goats and bulls, and ashes of a heifer sprinkling them that have been defiled, sanctify unto the cleansing of the flesh." (b) From moral pollution. I Cor. 6:11, "And such were some of you, but ye were washed, but ye were sanctified . . . in the Spirit of our God." (3)

That of separation from the guilt of sin. Heb. 12:13, "Wherefore, Jesus, also, that he might sanctify the people through his own blood, suffered without the gate." See also Heb. 10:10, 14, where Christ is said to sanctify us through his blood, by his sacrifice, it is the cleansing away of guilt that is prominent in the mind of the writer. (4) Of the declaration of God's separation. Matt. 6:9, "Hallowed be thy name." I Peter 3:15, "But sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord."

3. The most important meaning possessed by these two words in common is that of separation from moral pollution. It is this sense of the words which is taken when the doctrine of sanctification is discussed. The Westminster Shorter Catechism defines this separation from moral pollution as follows: Question 25. "Sanctification is the work of God's free grace, whereby we are renewed in the whole man and are enabled more and more to die unto sin and to live unto righteousness."

II. State the Different Views of the Nature of Sanctification. Disproving the False Views; and Proving the True View Correct.

1. The Pelagians deny original sin, and man's moral inability to the good, hold that sin can be predicated only of acts of volition, and deny that it can be predicated of inherent states or dispositions. Therefore, they teach that sanctification is merely moral reformation of life and habits, wrought under the influence of the truth, by the sinner in his own unaided strength, and assert that it may be perfect in this life.

Their premises are false. Original sin is a fact. Man is totally depraved in that he is radically indisposed to love God, to regulate his life according to God's law, and morally impotent for his own self-recuperation. The proof of this native and total depravity is overwhelming* That sin is predicable of dispositions rather than of volitions is equally clear from the testimony of consciousness* and of God's word. Christ himself exhorts us to make the tree good and his fruit good, or else the tree evil and his fruit evil.

Since the Pelagian principles are absolutely false, their conclusions concerning sanctification are worthless.

2. Rome confounds sanctification with justification. But they are clearly distinguished in the word of God. Justification is forensic—

---

*See proofs in Lecture XXVIII., p. 324, et seq. of Dabney's Theology.

*See Dabney's Theology, p. 133ff., for the proof from consciousness.

declared in the court of heaven—manifested pre-eminently in the last great day, though to a degree through the life of the justified here on earth. Sanctification is wrought in man—a renewal of the regenerate man's moral and spiritual nature, making it more Christ-like. Rome also holds that a "perfect sanctification" may be attained in this life. The former error is more conveniently refuted in dealing with the doctrine of justification by faith. The latter will be handled in dealing with the question: "Is Perfect Sanctification Attainable in This Life?"

3. Certain Wesleyans hold, not only that there is a progressive sanctification, a progressive elevation of the character in holiness, but that "entire" or "perfect sanctification" is attainable in this life. We shall discuss this error also under the head: "Is Perfect Sanctification Attainable in This Life?"

4. The Advocates of the "Exercise Scheme" hold that we can find nothing in the soul other than the agent and exercises. That regeneration, therefore, is nothing more than the cessation from a series of unholy exercises; and that sanctification is simply the maintenance of these exercises. One party, represented by Dr. Emmons, teaches that these holy exercises are immediately effected by God. Another party, headed by Dr. N. W. Taylor, of New Haven, teaches that man himself determines the character of his own exercises by choosing God as his chief good, the Holy Spirit assisting in some mysterious way.

The premise of these parties, that there is nothing in the soul but the agent and his actions is false. No sane man believes that he is without qualities, or that he is not a true agent. Consciousness tells him that he has fundamental traits. The word of God is equally decisive that we are qualified by affections—traits—of a radical sort. It exhorts us to mortify our "members which are upon the earth." (Col. 3:5), and it names amongst these members, covetousness—a quality. We have just seen that the Scriptures teach a native and universal bent toward sin. If Emmons were right in teaching that God is sole cause of the soul's exercises, the soul would deserve neither praise nor blame. Nor would there be a soul—a responsible agent.

If Dr. Taylor were right in holding that the agent and its exercises were all that is in the soul—that the soul had no moral quality as such—then all its actions would be equally colorless morally—would be amoral. Hence this view of sanctification must be repudiated as worthless.

5. Many members of the Church of England, not however in the Evangelical party, hold that a man, by conforming to the Church, which they represent as the condition of the Gospel covenant, is introduced to the benefits of that covenant; and is, by the decent performance of

relative duties and observance of the sacraments, enabled to attain all the moral good possible for him, or desirable.

This is to externalize and to despiritualize the Gospel covenant. It debases the ideal of sanctification, which is conformity to Christ, and leaves out all reference to the great agent of sanctification, which is the Holy Spirit. 2 Thess. 2: 13, "God chose you from the beginning unto salvation in sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth."

6. The Oberlin people e. g. President Mahan and Professor Finney, held that the Christian can attain perfect sanctification by the exercise of his own powers, since "God has no right to command of any man what he is unable to do." These people had fallen back into the fundamental falsehood of the Pelagian position, that ability limits obligation even in the moral sphere.

7. The advocates of the "Higher Life," the "Second Blessings," the Keswick School, and the advocates of "the resurrection life," and of the "victorious life" hold that sanctification is a grace that may be had in perfection in this life, instantaneously, by a single act of faith.

These people tell us that believers in general have received Jesus Christ only as their justification. "They have learned only that their sins are forgiven through faith in the atonement of Jesus. They have not yet learned that Jesus, through faith in his name, is the deliverer from the power of sin, as well as from its penalty. They sigh and groan in their bondage as if there was no deliverance this side of the grave. Not knowing that Jesus can deliver them, they turn with a sigh toward death as their deliverer from the power of this death, as if death were the sanctifier or the sanctification of the Children of God."* They tell us that a life *above conscious sin* may be had; and that "in order to enter into this blessed interior life of rest and triumph you have two steps to make. First, entire abandonment; and, second, absolute faith." "Commit your case to Him in absolute abandonment, and believe that he undertakes (to deliver you at once into an unsinning condition, so far as conscience speaks); and at once, knowing what he is and what he has said, claim that he does even now fully save. Believe that he (now) delivers you from the power of sin, because *he says so.*" "Consecrate your doubts to Christ. Believe that he does receive you. Reckon yourself to be a Christian, yea a fully sanctified Christian. Enter at once upon a life of practical holiness; and go on your way rejoicing!" They give directions for recovering the higher life blessing when it has been lost. Viz.: "Believe steadfastly through every thing, no matter what comes, just what you believed at first, upon your entering into this blessed 'Higher Life,' and never doubt it again. If the step of

faith you took then, was to reckon yourself to be dead indeed into sin, continue thus to reckon without wavering. If it was to believe that the blood of Jesus cleansed you from al unrighteousness, go on believing this steadily, and without any compromises. Or, if it simply came to you as a faith that Jesus saved you fully, exercise that very same faith now, and keep exercising it continually without intermission."*

Remark in this place the errors of these people with regard to faith: (1) According to them true faith consists not in believing on the Lord Jesus Christ, but in believing that we are received and fully sanctified—an unscriptural definition of faith. (2) They assume that we can believe by putting forth a volition to believe. (3) They also strip faith of the element of feeling.

At times they make it only a mental conviction. These last errors may be harmonized by asserting that faith is a mental conviction reached through an act of the will in applying the mind to the evidence of Christianity. But there can be no act of the will touching the object of faith save as that act of the will is motioned by feeling at least in part.

The apostles taught, says Mr. Robert C. McQuilkin, "As the birthright of Christians, complete supernatural victory over sin" (The Victorious Life, p. 29). "Satan's great word in talking to us about the Victorious Life, and about all the blessings that our hearts are craving tonight, is 'not now, but later!'" He tells us that we must never expect complete victory over sin until we get our resurrection bodies," (Ibid. 30, 31). "The only qualification for the resurrection life is the letting go of the self-life. We call it 'surrender,' and we shall hear a great deal about it during these conference days," (Ibid. 31). Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas asserts, "Victory is possible." "Let not sin reign in your mortal bodies; Be not overcome of evil; This is the victory that overcometh the world," etc. If these passages teach any thing at all, they clearly teach the possibility of victory. The apostle Paul says, "I can do all things in him who is strengthening me, empowering me." "So let us face this possibility of victory" (Ibid. pp. 37. 38).

He gives to the human will, power to resist God effectually, as in the following citations: "God comes to you and me, and says, 'will you believe?' And if you say, 'No,' there is a barrier between you and God, and nothing can take that down unless you and I do it ourselves. But if we say, 'Yes, Lord, I am prepared to believe,' that is the work of faith: I believe God, that it shall be" (Ibid. p. 44). "If you are prepared tonight to crown Jesus Christ the Lord of your life, you have

*See W. E. Boardman: *The Higher Christian Life.*

instant and constant victory" (Ibid. p. 46). He teaches that the primary and fundamental idea of sanctification is neither an achievement nor a process, but a gift, a Divine bestowal of position in Christ. So that while justification may be considered to refer to position leading to condition, so sanctification includes both position and condition . . . Both Justification and Sanctification are, therefore, complete from God's standpoint, but while Justification needs immediate and complete acceptance, Sanctification calls for thorough recognition followed by constant realization" (p. 72). He holds that from God's point of view every Christian is equally sanctified with every other—equally *separated* to his service, but that this sanctification is realized in different measures in different Christians; and that it may be realized at once to the extent that the Christian may be raised to a state of unsinningness; though he holds also that he may tumble into sin, if he slacks in faith—in just resting on God in Christ.

Mr. Charles Gallaudet Trumbull says, "Another point God wants us to remember as to the Victorious Life is this: It is the life in which we are kept from *sin in our hearts.*" "Many of us have thought that so long as we kept the sin in our hearts and did not let it express itself at all we were having victory" ("The Victorious Life," p. 135). "If we trust our Lord wholly we do have complete victory for now, for the present moment, while we are trusting" (Ibid. p. 103). "I stopped trying to work for him, and stopped asking him to help me, by saying, 'Lord Jesus, you are doing it all,' and by rolling the burden on him. I at once had a new fellowship with God, a new Bible, a new prayer life, and wonderfully new results in service, when I stopped trying to serve him, and asked him (living in me) to do it all."

"So I passed then into victory which has continued whenever in the eight years since then I have trusted him to do it, and when I have not trusted him there has been defeat," (Ibid. p. 330).

Thus the representatives of the victorious life belief, differ somewhat among themselves. Nor is any one of them thoroughly self-consistent in his teaching. Mr. McQuilkin regards the victory as more decided than Mr. Trumbull does, and Mr. Trumbull regards it as more decided than Dr. Thomas does.

Mr. Trumbull is a quietist with tendencies toward Pelagianism. Even Dr. Thomas betrays Pelagian views of the will—an error which has been so often refuted that it needs only to be pointed out. His arguments, and those of the Victorious Life people generally, for perfection, from the Scriptures, are from passages misunderstood, misinterpreted and misapplied. They will be considered and refuted under the question: Is Perfect Sanctification Attainable in This Life?

There is little doubt that all these perfectionists schools are historically connected. The advocates of the Victorious Life in America today are confessedly Keswickites. See W. H. Griffith Thomas, in *Bibliotheca Sacra,* for July, 1919; also the volume entitled *The Victorious Life,* published 1918, by the Board of Managers of Victorious Life Conference. The Keswick School was set agoing by Mr. and Mrs. Pearsall Smith and Professor Mahan, of Oberlin, between 1873 and 1875; and this early American perfectionism had roots not only in the Perfectionism of W. E. Boardman and others, but in Wesleyanism, and even Pelagianism.

Representatives of these Schools, as has appeared, have differed among themselves as to the nature of the perfection attainable. More of this, and of their error as to how perfection may be obtained, when we discuss the question: "Is Perfect Sanctification Attainable in This Life?"

8. The Plymouth Brethren hold an erroneous doctrine as to sanctification. They assert that both the idea of the mortification of the old man, and the idea of progressive sanctification are false. They ascribe the same completeness to sanctification from its inception, as to justification; if they do not quite combine them. Thus* regeneration is defined: "It is a new birth, the imparting of a new life, the implanting of a new nature, the formation of a new man. The old nature remains in all its distinctness; and the new nature is introduced in all its distinctness. This new nature has its own desires, its own tendencies, its own affections. All these are spiritual, heavenly, divine. Its aspirations are all upward. It is ever breathing after the heavenly source from which it emanated. Regeneration is to the soul what the birth of Isaac was to the household of Abraham. Ishmael remained the same Ishmael, but Isaac was introduced." On page 80, "Be warned that the old nature is unchanged. The hope of transforming that into holiness is vain as the dream of a philosopher's stone, which was to turn the dross of earth into gold" . . . "On the other hand, never be discouraged by new proof, that that which is born of the flesh is flesh. It is there; but it is condemned and crucified with its affections and lusts. Reckon it so, and that therefore you are no longer to serve it. It is just as true that that which is born of the spirit is spirit, and remains uncontaminated by that with which it maintains a ceaseless conflict." So. Vol. V., p. 302, "Thus two men there are in the Christian: So hath he evil and so hath he not evil. If therefore he purge out the evil, it is his new man purging

---

*Footnote; *Waymarks in the Wilderness,* Vol. III., pp. 342-343.

out his old man. Now these two men, within the control of the personality of the Christian, are real men, having each his own will, his own energy, and his own enjoyment."

In answer to this exaggerated view we assert, *first* that while the Apostle, Romans 7:23, speaks of "another law in his members warring against the law of his mind," the Scriptures nowhere say that regeneration implants a "new nature" or that the Christian has in him "two natures" much less two "real men." Shall I be reminded of Gal. 5:17, "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit and the Spirit against the flesh," in which "the Spirit" and "flesh" are said to lust against each other? The "Spirit" is the Holy Spirit. So judges Calvin; and so decides the context in verses 16 to 18 ("But, I say, walk by the Spirit and ye shall not fulfill the lusts of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; for these are contrary one to the other; that ye may not do the things that ye would. But if ye are led by the Spirit ye are not under law"). So in that chapter it is a violation of the Apostle's meaning to represent the "works of the flesh," verse 19 ("fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness") and the "fruits of the Spirit," verses 22, 23 ("love, joy, peace, longsuffering, meekness, self-control"), as occupying the same man, in full force,contemporaneously. The 24th verse ("And they that are of Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with the passions and the lusts thereof") shows, that the latter extrude and succeed the former; and that this result is the evidence of a state of grace.

Our popular language sometimes uses the word "nature" in the sense of moral *habitus;* and we speak of grace as "changing the nature" or "producing a new nature." But in strictness the language is neither philosophical nor Scriptural. Philosophically speaking a nature is the aggregate of essential attributes of a thing. Were this changed the identity would be gone. In the case of a person, his personal identity would be gone, and his whole responsibility would be dissolved.* The fall did not change man's essentiae—essential attributes; nor does the new creation. Each changes the moral habitus of man's powers, the fall to depravity, the new creation back toward holiness.

* * * * *

*Footnote: The word nature is used in a popular sense in Eph. 2:3, "Were by nature the children of wrath even as others." Here the word "nature" is used not only of the aggregate of the essential attributes, but of them including the non-essential but important quality (*habitus*) of sin.

The notion of two personalities also, in one man, is preposterous. Here the appeal to consciousness is decisive. If there were either two "natures" or two "real men" in him, every Christian must have a dual consciousness. But I need not dwell on the truth which every man knows, that while this is a vital change, consciousness is as much one as in the unrenewed state. The motives are indeed complex, but the will is one. Regeneration has wrought a prevalent, but not absolute revolution, in the moral disposition regulative of the Christian's motives. Amidst the complex of subjective states which lead to any one volition, some elements may be spiritual and some carnal. As regeneration has established a new and prevalent (though not exclusive) law of disposition, so sanctification confirms and extends that new law in introducing more and more of the right elements and more and more extruding the wrong elements.

Let us, *second,* bring the matter to the test of Scripture. What do the Scriptures teach as to the thing renewed, or sanctified? Do they teach that sanctification is done at once or gradually? (1) They teach that the thing which is renewed is the sinful soul I Cor. 6:11, "And such were some of you, but ye were washed, but ye were sanctified." Eph. 2:1-5, "And you did he make alive, when ye were dead through your trespasses and sins." etc. Eph. 4:23, "And that ye be renewed in the spirit of your mind." Col. 1:21-22, "And you being in time past alienated and enemies in your mind in your evil works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and without blemish and unreproved before him." (2) Both the sanctification of the soul and the mortification of sin are expressly declared to be progressive processes. Acts 20:32, "And now I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace; which is able to build you up, and to give you the inheritance among all them that are sanctified." Eph. 4:11-16, "And he gave some to be apostles; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ: till we attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ; that we may be no longer children tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine—but speaking the truth in love, may grow up in all things into him, who is the head even Christ," etc. Phil. 3:13-15, "Brethren, I count not myself yet to have laid hold: but one thing I do, forgetting the things which are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before, I press on toward the goal unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. Let us therefore as many as are perfect, be thus minded; and if in anything ye are other-

wise minded, this also shall God reveal unto you." I Cor., 7:1, "having therefore these promises, beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." I Thess. 5:23; Heb. 6:1, I Pet. 2:2, II Pet. 3:18, Col. 3:5, "Put to death, therefore, your members which are upon the earth," etc.

Further, (3) the Bible compares the saint to living and growing things; as the vine, the fruit tree, the plant of corn, the infant; all of which exhibit their lives in growth. Grace is also compared to "the morning light, waxing brighter and brighter to the perfect day," and to the leaven spreading through the whole vessl of meal; and to the mustard-seed, the smallest sown by the Jewish hubandman, but growing gradually to the largest of herbs. Is not the rhetoric of the Word just? Then we must suppose the analogy exists; and that the spiritual life, like vegetable and animal, regularly displays its power by growth. These innovators borrow the Popish plea, that "the new-creation, being God's work, must be perfect." I reply: The infant is also a work of God's power and sikll; but he is designed to grow to an adult.

We find this idea incompatible, in the third place, with the laws of a finite rational creature. These are such that every faculty, affection and habit must grow by their exercise, or be enervated by their disuse and suppression. Depravity grows in sinners (II Tim. 3:13, "But evil men and imposters shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived") grows as long as it is unchecked. So holiness must grow by its exercise. Even the pagan Horace understood this growth of evil. *Crescentem sequitur cura pecuniam, majorumque fames.* This being the law of man's mutable nature, it must follow that as exercise increases the principles of holiness, so the denial of the flesh must enervate and diminish the principles of sin.

I object in the *fourth* and *last* place, to the anti-nomian tendencies that are, at least latently, involved in this scheme: (1) If one believes that he has two "real men," or "two natures" in him, he will be tempted to argue that the new man is in no way responsible for the perversity of the old. Here is a perilous deduction. (2) But the next is worse as it is more obvious. If the new nature is complete at first, and the old never loses any of its strength till death; then the presence, and even the flagrancy of indwelling sin need suggest to the believer no doubts whatever, whether his faith is spurious. How can it be denied that here is terrible danger of carnal security in sin? How different this from the Bible which says, Jas. 2:18, "Show me thy faith without thy works; and I will show thee my faith by my works." If the flesh is reviving, spiritual life is just to that extent receding; and just in degree

as that recession proceeds, has one Scriptural grounds to suspect that his faith is (and always was) dead.

9. The true view of Sanctification may be briefly stated and proved as follows: Sanctification is a renewal of the whole man in the image of God. It is the gradual development and increase of the graces of faith, hope, love, repentance and all the graces bestowed in regeneration, and the gradual mortification and extirpation of every evil quality and affection. Eph. 4:23-24, "And be renewed in the spirit of your mind," "and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." II Pet. 3:18, "Grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." Col. 3:12, "Put to death, therefore, your members which are upon the earth, fornication, uncleanness, passion, evil desire, and covetuousness which is idolatry." "Put on therefore, as God's elect, holy and beloved, a heart of compassion, kindness, meekness, longsuffering." Jude 20, "But ye beloved, building up yourselves in your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost." Eph. 3:16-17, "That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, that ye may be strengthened with power through his Spirit in the inward man: that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; to the end that ye may be rooted and grounded in love." Sanctification is the conflict with, and victory over, indwelling sin described in Rom. 7:14—8:28. This passage deals with the struggle and groaning of the still partially enslaved will. "Even we ourselves who have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body. For we are saved by hope. Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities, and maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered," Rom. 8:23, 24, 26.

These are a few of the passages which vindicate the correctness of the doctrine of sanctification as stated in the Shorter Catechism, question and answer 35: "Sanctification is the work of God's grace whereby we are renewed in the whole man after the image of God and enabled more and more to die unto sin and live unto righteousness."

III. How Is Sanctification Distinguished from, and How Related to, Regeneration and Justification?

1. Sanctification matures what regeneration began. Regeneration originates the principle of spiritual life. Sanctification develops that principle until there appears first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear. See Eph. 4:23, 24.

2. God does different things for man in justification and sanctification: In justification he removes the guilt of sin, in sanctification its

pollution. In justification he changes only our legal relations, in sanctification our actual moral condition. Justification is an act, sanctification a process. Justification is instantaneous and complete in all. Sanctification is imperfect in its degree in all this side the grave, unequal in different Christians, and is increased throughout life." Justification takes place in God's court, sanctification in the believer's person.

Justification, initial faith, and regeneration are contemporaneous; but justification comes logically on the heels of faith, and faith logically on the heels of regeneration. It, therefore, precedes sanctification, which is a life-long process, in which the principle implanted in regeneration is developed, and the principle of sin dwarfed and made more and more subject to the new principle.

Justification makes for sanctification. The believer's sense of his justification motives his co-operation with God for his sanctification. He follows after sanctification because he feels that he has been justified; he obeys the law not in order to be justified but because he has been justified. Gratitude to Christ, and love to him, for the remission of sins through his blood are the sources of the effort at co-operation toward sanctification. II Cor. 5:14, "The love of Christ constraineth us not to live unto ourselves, but unto him who died for us." Here we are taught that our sense of Christ's redeeming love moves us so. II Cor. 7:1, "Having these promises (of forgiveness) let us cleanse ourselves from filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." Sanctification does not justify, but justification makes for sanctification.

While the two graces must be discriminated, while it is by compounding them that Rome has introduced her theory of justification by self-righteousness, their connection is important as just indicated. It is a necessary, uniform, essential connection. This is proven by the following arguments.*

* * * * *

*Footnote: For these arguments see Dabney's Theology. pp. 663-664.

* * * * *

(a) The Covenant of Grace embraces both. Jeremiah 31:33, "This is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith Jehovah: I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it; and I will be their God and they shall be my people." Rom. 8:30, "Whom he justified them he also glorified." The covenant links purification with justification.

(b) The sanctity of the divine nature requires it. I Pet. 1:15, 16, "Like as he who called you is holy, be ye yourselves also holy in all manner of living; because it is written, 'Ye shall be holy, for I am holy'." The saved to the communion with God in Heaven must be purified perfectly, for no unclean thing can enter there.

(c) The connection appears inevitable from the offices of Christ; for he is king as well as priest to all his people. Rom. 8:29, "For whom he foreknew, he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of his son." Rom. 6:11, "Even so reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus." Titus 2:14, "Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a people for his own possession, zealous of good works." Rom. 8:2, 'For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death."

The selfishness and guilty conscience of man powerfully prompt him to look to the Savior exclusively as a remedy for guilt, even when awakened by the Spirit. The first and most urgent want of the soul convicted of its guilt and danger, is impunity. Hence the undue prevalence of that view of Christ which regards him as expiator of sin only. It has appeared that even an Owen could be guilty of what I regard as the dangerous statement, that the true believer, in embracing Christ, first receives him only in his priestly office! The faith which does no more than this, is defective and can bear only spurious fruits. This may be part explanation of much of the spurious religion with which the church is cursed. The man who is savingly wrought upon by the Holy Ghost, is made to feel that his bondage under corruption is an evil as inexorable and dreadful as the penal curse of the law. He needs and desires Christ in his prophetic and kingly offices, as much as in his priestly office. His faith "receives Christ as he is offered to us in the gospel," that is, as a Savior of his people from their sins."

(d) The office of the Holy Ghost shows this connection; for his influences are a part of Christ's purchase. But he is the Spirit of Holiness. Rom. 8:9, "If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his."

(e) The sacraments symbolize cleansing from pollution as well as from guilt. Col. 2:11, 12, "In whom ye were all circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands, in the putting off of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ: having been buried with him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead." Tit. 3:5, "According to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewal of the Holy Ghost."

(f) Redemption would be a mockery without sanctification; for sin itself and not the eternal wrath of God, is the cause of misery here, and eternal death hereafter. Hence to deliver the fallen son of Adam from his guilt, and leave him under the power of corruption, would be no salvation.

(g) The chief and ultimate end of salvation, which is God's glory (Rom. 11:36; Is. 61:3; Eph. 1:5,6), would be utterly disappointed, were believers not required to depart from all sin. For God's holiness, his consumate attribute, would be tarnished by taking to his favor polluted creatures. This argument suggests, also, the second, where God points to his own perfect holiness as the reason for his people's being holy. No argument could be plainer. An unholy creature has no place in the bosom of a holy God. As I have argued in another place, God's holy law is as immutable as his nature; and no change of relation whatever, can abbrogate it as a rule of right action.

In the saving process, then, justification and sanctification are necessarily connected.

IV. What the Subject of Sanctification? Is It the Whole Man—Inclinations, Power of Choice, Power of Intellection, and the Body?

1. The Subject of sanctification is the entire man. I Thes. 5:23, "The very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless."*

The Pelagian idea, that holiness can only be acted by man has already been shown to be false: (a) There must be holiness of the soul that its actions may be holy. These actions get their character only from the qualities of the agent—from his dispositions which determine the volitions. Otherwise volitions materially right can have no holiness. Hence outward reformation can not be sanctification.

True outward reformation of a genuine sort, is a consequence of sanctification as is implied in Matt. 12:33, 34. "Either make the tree good and its fruit good, or make the tree corrupt and his fruit corrupt, for the tree is known by its fruit. Ye offspring of vipers, how can ye,

---

*Footnote: In the words I Thess. 5:23, the apostle expresses an idea of the *entire man* by employing the three comprehensive terms of Platonic anthropology current in his day, not to endorse the scheme (so the analogy of faith argues), but to include all faculties of the human spirit and the body.

being evil, speak good things?" That holiness must be of the soul primarily—that the soul must be the subject of sanctification—may be further argued by considering: (b) That holiness in man must be conceived as the counterpart of sin. (The Pelagian admits this.) But sin is both original and actual. Sin of heart is the fountain of the sin of life. Hence, it is fair to infer, as our Savior does, in fact, in the places cited, that sanctification has its seat in the heart. (c) That since infants cannot act a sanctification, and yet, as all admit, may be sanctified, sanctification must be of the soul. (4) That the synonymous phrases all speak of "a clean heart," of "circumcision of the heart," and (e) That the Scriptures are emphatic in their assertions. Eph. 4:23, 24, "And that ye be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put on the new man, that after God is created in righteousness and holiness of truth." Gal. 5:24, "And they that are of Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with the passions and the lusts thereof." Tit. 3:5, "According to his mercy he saved us through the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." Luke 17:21, "The Kingdom of God is within you." Sanctification is then of the soul, of the spirit, primarily, and of the volitions in consequence.

2. If we inquire as to the faculty of the soul itself which is primarily affected in sanctification, the answer must be that the faculty is the will in the inclusive sense of the term will; and in the will itself the conative powers or appetencies, or inclinations, as they are variously called. For when we analyze the elements of human character and conduct in which moral quality resides, we are compelled to say that strictly speaking, it is only in the state and acting of man's active powers. If there is neither directive activity—affectional, desiring, appetentive, activity—nor choice involved in any human act, that act has no moral character.

When we speak of the active and practical powers as the primary seat of sanctification in the soul, we must not be understood to mean a department of the soul and thus to indicate that its sanctification is primarily of a patch of itself. The soul has no patches or parts, but is one indivisible unit, acting in different modes. It is the soul which is sanctified, and not a faculty; but the soul as to a particular mode of its activity, viz. the active and practical, is the primary seat of sanctification.

3. Sanctification of the active and practical powers leads to sanctification of every mode of the soul's activity. Sanctification, primarily of the active and practical power—sanctification of the soul in this mode of its activity—is a moral change in the soul, in its most important *accidens,* and, in its results; and modifies every activity of the soul,

whether intellectual, volitive or corporeal. Hence every one considers that he is speaking with sufficient accuracy in using the words "a wicked thought"; and must consider that we speak with equal accuracy, when we talk of the sanctification of the intellect. For a thought is wicked, not because the faculty of thinking, or pure intellection, is the seat of moral quality, abstractly considered; but because the soul that thinks, gives to that thought, by the concurrence of its active or emotional, or voluntary power, a complex character, in which complex there is a wrong moral element. Hence to sanctify the intellect is to sanctify the soul in such a way that in its complex acts the moral element shall be right instead of wrong.

4. Similarly, we speak with entire propriety of a "wicked blow." The bones, skin, and muscle which were used in inflicting it, are the unreasoning and passive implements of the soul that commited the volition to strike. But our members are sanctified when the volitions which move them are holy; and when the impressions of sense and appetite, of which they are the inlets, become the occasion of no wrong feeling or volitions.

The sanctification of the body is not to be identified with the Mediaeval ascetic treatment of the body. The sanctification of the body consists in the employment of the members as the implements of none but holy volitions, and in such management and regulation of the senses, that they shall be the inlets of no objective, or occasional causes of wrong feeling. This implies, of course, strict temperance, continence, and avoidance of temptation to the sinful awakening of appetite, as well as the preservation of muscular vigor, and healthy activity, by self-denial and bodily hardihood. Thus Paul I Cor. 9:27, "I buffett my body and bring it into bondage: Lest by any means, after I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." Compare Jas. 3:2, "If any man stumbleth not in word, the same is a perfect man, able to bridle the whole body also." See also II Pet. 2: 14, 15. The whole theory of Mediaeval asceticism is refuted by the simple fact that the soul is the seat of holiness; and that the body is only indirectly holy or unholy, as it is the tool of the soul. The whole ascetic delusion so far as it has sought a Scriptural support rests on the mistake as to the meaning of the word "flesh," sarx, which sacred writers use to mean depraved human nature; not the body. What those fleshly members are, which sanctification mortifies, may be seen in Col. 3:5, "Put to death therefore your members which are upon the earth: fornication, uncleanness, passion, evil desire, and covetousness which is idolatry." Gal. 5: 19-21, "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, sorcery, enmities, strife, jealousies,

wraths, factions, divisions, parties, envyings, drunkenness, revelings and such like, of which I . . . forewarn you, that those that practice such things shall not inherit the Kingdom of God."

V. Who the Agents, and What the Means of Sanctification—The Outer Means; and the Inner Means?

1. The Scriptures attribute sanctification: 1st. To God absolutely. I Thess. 5:23, "The God of peace himself sanctify you wholly." 2nd. To the Father, Heb. 13:20-21, "Now the God of peace—make you perfect in every good thing." 3rd. To the Son, Eph. 5:25, 26, "Husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word." Tit. 2:14, "Who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a people for his own possessions, zealous of good works." I Cor. 1:30. 4th. To the Holy Ghost I Cor. 6:11, "And such were some of you; but ye were washed, ye were sanctified, but ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God." II Thess. 2:13, "Because from the beginning he hath chosen you unto salvation in sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." Ps. 51:10, 11, "Renew a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence and take not thy Holy Spirit from me." The Scripture represents the Holy Ghost as the immediate agent in sanctification. See I Cor. 6:11; I Pet. 1:2.

Now there is nothing inconsistent in these various representations. Christ is our sanctifier, because he procures the benefit for us by his justifying righteousness; because he is now the God of Providence, and dispenser of means to his people, and because of his perpetual intercession. He procures and dispenses to us the influences of the Holy Ghost, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son. The Father is our sanctifier; (John 17:17 "Sanctify them in the truth, thy word is truth"), because he stands in the Covenant of Grace as the representative of the whole Trinity, and is the deviser of the whole gracious means and the sender of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

As to the nature of the divine operation in sanctification: that nature is indicated by remarking that sanctification is the continuance of the process of which the initial step was effectual calling. If effectual calling involves a supernatural element additional to the moral suasion of the truth, then sanctification is the result of the same sort of agency.

2. The believer himself is an agent in his sanctification. He co-operates with God by the more or less energetic use of the means which God puts at his command. Hence such exhortations as Phil. 2:12 "Work through to a finish your own salvation with fear and trembling."

3. While the divine agency in sanctification involves the supernatural, while the indwelling and operation of the Holy Ghost are required to continue growth in grace, yet He operates *through means;* and these means may be said comprehensively, so far as they are outer means, to be (a) God's truth, (b) His ordinances, and (c) His providence. Such passages as Ps. 19:1-7, plainly show that not only God's revealed word, but His truth seen through the works of nature, may sanctify the believer. But there is no reason to suppose that the truths of natural theology have any sanctifying agency, where they are not confirmed and enlarged by revelation.

Truth has no adequate efficiency to sanctify by itself, indeed, yet it has a natural adaptation to be the means of sanctification in the hand of the Holy Spirit. For it is religious truth that presents all the objective conditions of holy exercises and acts. That man's active powers may be holily exercised an object of acting is needed, as well as a power of acting. Thus in natural vision there must be something to see in order to sight. Now, religious truth presents that whole body of theological facts, of examples, of inducements, of provocatives, by which the soul is incited to act. I Pet. 1:22, "Seeing that you have purified your souls in your obedience to the truth." I Pet. 2:12, "As new-born babes long for the spiritual milk which is without guile, that ye may grow thereby unto salvation."

By the ordinances we mean (1) the sacraments, and (2) the worship of God, according to his apointment, generally (the preaching and reading of the word excepted, as included under the preceding: the truth). The sacraments are means whereby God symbolizes and seals to us the same truths expressed verbally in Revelation. They are a kind of acted instead of spoken word, bringing to the soul, in a still more lively manner, those views of the truth, which the Holy Spirit makes the occasion, or objective of holy exercises. The other appointed exercises of worship and especially that of prayer are means of sanctification when sincerely engaged in, according to God's appointment. Acts in which the soul engages in communion with God and glories in God's perfections, they tend to assimilate the character of the worshiper towards God's character. Prayer, moreover, is the appointed means of receiving grace for sanctification. God has promised to answer believing prayer for spiritual gifts by their donation. John 14:13, 14, "And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask anything in my name that will I do."

Last, (d) God's providences, both prosperous and adverse, are powerful means of sanctification, because they impress religious truth, and force it home, by operating with the word and Holy Ghost on our natural emotions. Ps. 119:71, "It is good for me that I have been afflicted that I might learn thy statutes." John 15:2, "Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he taketh it away, and every branch that beareth fruit he purgeth it that it may bring forth more fruit." Rom. 5:3, 4, "And not only so, but we also rejoice in our tribulations, knowing that tribulation worketh steadfastness; and steadfastness, approvedness; and approvedness, hope; and hope putteth not to shame." Heb. 12:10, "For they indeed for a few days chastened us as it seemed good to them; but he for our profit, that we may be partakers of his holiness." It should be remarked, however, that two things must concur if providences are to sanctify: The light of the Word on the providences to interpret them and give them their meaning, and the agency of the Holy Spirit inclining the heart to embrace the truths they serve to impress. Mere suffering does not produce holiness.

Looking back we may see that there is a sense in which the revealed word is the uniform means of sanctification. It gives the necessary fullness and authority to natural theology. It guides, authorizes and instructs our worship. It is symbolized in the sacraments. It shines through the providences, which illustrate and enforce it. So that the word is the means in all other means. John 17:17, "Sanctify them in the truth, Thy Word is truth." Where the word is not, there is no holiness.

4. The inner means of sanctification are faith and repentance. These two graces are the media through which the outer means come into efficacious contact with the soul. It is only when an object is apprehended by a full and active faith that it becomes the occasion of any act of the soul. A hundred illustrations are at hand, which show that this is universally true, and as true in man's carnal as in his spiritual life. But in order that belief may become a provocative to action, the object believed must be so related to the affections of the mind, that there shall be appetancy and repulsion. In the case of saving faith the relation is the active affection of the regenerate soul for Christ and for things good, and a hatred of evil. Saving faith is, therefore, a necessary inner means by which the outer means of sanctification are appropriated. In like manner saving repentance feeds upon the outer means of sanctification and grows. In proportion as faith and repentance grow, sanctification grows. They are phases of sanctification as well as means.

The student may now understand why God gives these graces such prominence in practical religion. They are the organs for the appropriation of all graces. It follows obviously that repentance and faith must be in perpetual exercise throughout the whole progress of sanctification.

VI. Is Sanctification a Duty? What Say Antinomians?

1. While sanctification is a grace it is also a duty. While the subject is passive with respect to the divine act of grace which results in regeneration, after his regeneration he can co-operate with the Holy Spirit in the work of sanctification. The Holy Ghost gives the grace and prompts and directs in its exercise, and the soul can exercise it. The soul is under obligation, and is encouraged to use, with diligence in dependence upon the Spirit, all the means for its spiritual renewal, and to form those habits of resisting evil and of right action in which right character so largely consists. Hence the exhortations and commands: Ezekiel 18:31, "Make you a new heart and a new spirit." Regeneration is the sole work of God, it is a grace, but not a duty. Hence the Scriptures nowhere exhort to regeneration as a duty; but they abound in exhortations to believers to sanctify themselves. I Cor. 16:13, "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong." Eph. 4:22, 23, "Put off the old man and be renewed in the spirit of your mind." Eph. 6:16, 18, "Take the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God, praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance." Phil. 2:12, 13, "Work out your own salvation . . . for it is God that worketh in you to will and to do according to His good pleasure."

2. The Antinomians deny that sanctification is a duty. Notwithstanding all the clear teaching of Scripture, that sanctification is a duty, they hold that since Christ's obedience and suffering have satisfied the demands of the law, believers are free from the obligation to obey it, either as a condition of salvation or as a rule of duty.

We object to this conclusion:

(1) That since the law is a transcript of God's perfections, it is as unchanging as a rule of life as God Himself; and that only as a method of salvation has it been superceded since the fall and the protevangelium.

(2) That the believer in Christ rejoices in the fact that Christ has borne the penalty due to his sin and obeyed the law in his stead, so that he is for Christ's sake counted righteous; but that there is wrought

in him, by the Spirit which unites him to Christ, a disposition to obey God's holy law; and that he who discovers in himself no regard for the law, has no ground to hold that he is a true believer.

(3) That the freedom from the law of which the Scriptures speak, is, sometimes, freedom from the ceremonial law, and sometimes freedom from the whole law, moral and ceremonial, regarded as the means of salvation, and as a system of curse and penalty; and as an outward thing compelling us against our prevalent inward bent.

(4) That the Antinomian position is overthrown by the Scriptures which represent growth in grace, or sanctification, as a duty, and by Paul's treatment of it in Romans, the sixth chapter. There Paul teaches that this heresy was charged as a legitimate consequence of his doctrine of salvation by grace, in his own day. He repudiates the charge and "affirms that free justification through an imputed righteousness, without the merit of works, is the only possible condition in which the sinner can learn to bring forth holy works as the fruit of filial love. The very purpose of Christ was to redeem to himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works, and this he accomplished by delivering them from the federal bondage of the law, in order to render them capable as the Lord's free man of moral conformity to it, ever increasingly in this life, absolutely in the life to come."

VII. Is Perfect Sanctification Attainable In This Life?

1. It has already appeared that Pelagians, Romanists, Arminians, Oberlinists, Keswickites, and advocates of the Victorious Life hold that the believer's sanctification may be perfect in this life, but it has been affirmed also that these various schools differ both as to the nature of the perfection affirmed and as to means by which "perfection" is to be attained.

2. The points of agreement and disagreement between these several theories, Pelagian, Romish, Arminian, Oberlin, and Keswickian, (Victorious Life) may be stated as follows:

(1) They all agree that it is possible for men in this life to attain a state in which they may habitually and perfectly fulfill all their conscious obligations, i. e., to be and do perfectly all that God requires them to be and to do at present.

(2) The Pelagian theory differs from the rest, in denying all the deterioration of our natural and moral powers, and consequently, in denying the necessity of the intervention of supernatural grace in order to man's being made perfect.

(3) The Pelagian and Oberlin and Keswickian (Victorious Life) theories agree in making the original moral law of God the standard of perfection. The Oberlin theologians, however, admit that our moral powers are deteriorated by sin, and hold that God's law, as a matter of sheer force, adjusts its demands to the present ability of the subject. The Keswickians and Victorious Life people also admit that our moral powers are deteriorated by sin, and teach that we are enabled to comply with the law only by trusting in Christ who liveth and worketh in us. The Romish theory regards the same law as the standard of perfection, but differs from the Pelagian theory, and the Keswickian in maintaining that the demands of this law are adjusted to man's deteriorated powers; and on the other hand, it differs from the Oberlin theory in holding that the lowering of the demands of this law in adjustment to the enfeebled powers of man, instead of being of sheer justice, is of grace for the merits of Christ. The Arminian theory differs from all the rest in denying that the original law is the standard of evangelical perfection; in holding that the law having been fulfilled in Christ, the Christian is now required only to fulfill the requirements of the gospel covenant of grace. This, however, appears to differ more in form than in essence from the Romish position in this regard. The Keswickian or Victorious Life people differ from all the rest in holding that Christ in us worketh the perfection demanded by the unalterable law.

(4) The Romish, Arminian, and Keswickian (and Victorious Life) theories agree: 1st. In admitting that the perfect Christian is still liable to transgress the provisions of the original moral law, and that he is liable to mistakes and infirmities, which the Keswickians properly call sins. These sins which the Arminians call mistakes and infirmities, the Romanists call venial sins. 2nd. In referring all the work of making man perfect to the efficiency of a person of the Godhead, the Romanists and Arminians indicating the Holy Ghost as that person, who is given for Christ's sake, the Keswickians indicating Christ as that person who dwells in the heart by the Holy Spirit. They differ, however, on the other hand; (1) as to the means by which sanctification is effected. (a) Rome holds that it is effected by works and especially supererogatory works, (b) The Arminians, Keswickites and Victorious Life people hold that it is got by simple trust or faith in an instant. B. As to the degree of perfection: (a) The Romanists hold that he who is perfect may yet commit venial sins every day and is, till death, subject to the inward movements of concupiscence; (b) The Arminians claim that one who is perfect, is under the reign of perfect faith in Christ and perfect love to God, but is not freed either from liability to fall, or infirmities and corruption of the heart. (c) The

Keswickites hold that the perfect man is one who is saved from sinning, although he may be qualified by sin of nature. (d) Some Victorious Lifers seem to hold that the perfect man is not only one kept from sinning but lifted above sin of nature, e. g., Mr. R. C. McQuilken.

3. *The arguments used by their advocates to sustain these several views* of perfection are to a large extent the same. The common arguments are as follows: (1st) The means provided by God are completely adequate to this result, should he please to bless them; and it seems derogatory to His holy character to suppose he will not bless them to any extent to which his children shall aim to use them, since he assures us that "this is the will of God, even your sanctification." (2nd) He habitually commands us to pray for entire sanctification. Ps. 119:5, 6, "Oh that my ways were established to observe thy statutes. Then shall I not be put to shame when I have respect to all thy commandments." (3rd) Prayers of saints for their entire sanctification are recorded in the Scripture with implied approval. Ps. 51:2, "Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity and cleanse me from my sin." Heb. 13:21, "Make you perfect in every good thing to do his will, working in you that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ." (4th) God has promised to redeem Israel from all his iniquities. Ps. 130:8, "And He will redeem Israel from all his iniquities." Ezek. 36:25-29, "And I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my ordinances and do them. And ye shall dwell in the land that I gave your fathers; and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God. And I will save you from all your uncleanness." (5th) He has commanded us to be perfect. Matt. 5:48, "Ye therefore shall be perfect as your heavenly father is perfect." Unless obedience were possible, the command would be unjust. (6th) Perfect sanctification is nowhere connected with the death of the body, by specific texts. Indeed, the opinion that it must be, savors of Gnosticism, by representing that the seat of ungodliness is in the corporeal part, whereas we know that the body is merely the passive tool of the responsible spirit. (7th) As to the involuntary imperfections which every man, not insanely vain, must acknowledge, they are not properly sin. Here the Wesleyan manifestly resorts to the two Pelagian principles (a) "That man is not responsible for his volitions unless they are free not only from co-action, but from certainty; and (b) That moral quality resides only in acts of choice, so that a volition which is

prevalently good is wholly good. Hence, those imperfections in saints, into which they fall through inattention, or sudden gusts of temptation, contrary to their sincere preferences, incur no guilt whatever.*

* * * * *

(8th) They claim actual cases of perfection in Scripture. Gen. 6:9, "Noah was a righteous man and perfect in his generation." Ps. 119:1, "Blessed are they that are perfect in the way, who walk in the law of Jehovah." Job. 1:1, "And that man (Job) was perfect and upright, and one that feared God, and that turned away from evil." David, Ps. 37:37, "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright, for there is a happy end to the man of peace." Luke 1:6, "And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, blameless." I John 3:9, "Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin, because his seed abideth in him; and he cannot sin because he is begotten of God."

4. *Replying to these arguments in order we remark:* (1) The Scriptures do indeed show that God wills the sanctification of the believer, but not that the believer shall be perfectly holy in any moment prior to death; nor do, they show that the means of sanctification in this life, used to the utmost of any believer's power, are adequate to entire instantaneous sanctification; nor do they give any warrant to the believer to hold that God will supplement his utmost use of the means of sanctification by the grant before death of that supernatural aid without which perfect sanctification cannot be had.

(2nd) As we ought to be perfect God may command us to pray for perfection. It is a duty so to pray; but neither the obligation to pray for perfection, nor the command of God to pray for perfection, argues that we can become perfect in this life. That by praying earnestly for perfection we may be lifted toward it, is enought to justify God in commanding us to pray for it, if his grace move him to do so.

(3rd) That the Scripture records the prayers of saints for complete sanctification, with approval, shows that God approves the desire thus voiced, but indicates nothing as to the time when He has willed that they should have entire sanctification.

(4th) God's promise to redeem Israel from all his iniquities has not yet been completely fulfilled as to that part of Israel which is upon

---

*Footnote: The advocates of the Keswickian and Victorious Life views do not as a school make this argument, though some of them apparently at times hold it. See Warfield in the Princeton Review, as cited in the Syllabus.

the earth. That promise is of conditions in the country of which Canaan was a type, or of Canaan in the earth after its purification by fire.

(5th) That God has commanded us to be perfect, argues naught as to our ability to be perfect. God cannot require of us a physical impossibility; but our inability to keep God's whole law perfectly is not physical. It began in man's sin. By that sin we lost none of those faculties which, when Adam's will was right, enabled him to keep God's commandments without sin. Our impotency is an inability of will." Hence, it ought not to alter the demands of God's justice on his creatures. It is right in God to require perfection of us, and instruct us to seek it, because his own perfect nature can accept no less. Did God allow an inability of will to refute his just claims on the creature, then the more sinful the creature became, the less guilt would attach to his shortcomings. A creature need only render himself utterly depraved to become completely irresponsible.

(6th) Perfect sanctification is connected with the death of the body of the believers by Scripture teachings, although the Bible does not say, in so many words, that the soul's connection with the body is what occasions the incompleteness of sanctification. Scripture necessarily implies that sanctification is completed on the death of the body. For: (a) It teaches that there are none perfect this side of the grave. (b) That no one who is sinful shall enter the place which after death, is the home of the just. (c) Therefore that in the article of death sanctification is completed. For it teaches that at death saints do immediately pass into glory. Moreover it is not Gnosticism, but Scripture and common sense, to attribute some obstacles to entire sanctification to the continuance of the animal appetites in man. While God's omnipotence could overcome these obstacles, yet it is according to his manner of working, that he has seen fit to connect the final completeness of his work of grace in the soul, with this last change. Hence when the Scriptures show that this is his plan, we are prepared to believe it.

(7th) Involuntary imperfections are sin; and the Pelagian principles—that man is not responsible for his volitions unless they are free not only from co-action but from certainty: and that the moral quality resides only in acts of choice—are false. These principles are thoroughly Pelagian. We saw that the old Pelagians, admitting that a complete obedience is requisite for a justification by works, claimed that the obedience which is materially in strict accord with the statutes, and prevalently right in purpose, is right. We saw, also, how they defended this view in consistency with their false ethics: They place

the moral quality of acts in the volition, denying any certain efficiency to subjective motive as to objective inducement. Now, volition is, of course, an entire and single act. The motives of a single act may be complex, but the volition has a perfect unity. Hence, if the morality of the act is wholly in the volition, and not in those complex motives, if the purpose is right, the act is wholly so. But say, with us, that the volition derives its moral quality from the subjective motives (which is the doctrine of common sense and the Bible), and it follows that a volition may have a complex moral character; it may be prevalently right and yet not completely right. For, while volition is single, motive is complex. The least complex motive must involve a judgment and an appetency, and no objective thing is ever inducement to volition, until it stands in the soul's view in the category of the true and the good (the naturally good, at least). In the sense of this discussion, we should include, in the "subjective motive" of a given volition, all the precedent stages of judgment and appetency in the soul, which have causative influence in the rise of the volition. Then, many elements may enter into the subjective motive of a single volition; elements intellective and elements conative. Every one of these elements which has a moral quality, i. e., which arises under the regulative power of subjective, moral disposition, may contribute of its moral character to the resultant volition. Now, it is the plainest thing in the world that these elements may be, some holy and some unholy. Hence, the volitions while possessed of an absoulte singleness as a psychological function, may have mixed moral character—because, simply, it has morally mixed subjective springs in the agent's soul. This solution is simple; and, in several problems it is vital. Let it explain itself in an instance. A good Christian man is met in public by a destitute person, who asks alms. With deliberate consideration the relief is bestowed. The things which were present in the Christian's consciousness were these; the rush of instinctive or animal sympathy (morally negative while merely animal), a rational movement of Christian love (morally good), recognition of and desire for Christ's glory as displayed in the succor of his creature (morally good), the thoughts of, and pleasure in, his own applause as a philanthropist (morally negative, at least, and, if inordinate, criminal), selfish appetency to retain the money needed by the destitute person, for his own gratification (morally evil); and, last, a judgment of conscience. Now, the nature of that Christian's process of soul, during the instant he stood deliberating, was an adjusting of these concurring and competing elements of motive. The result was that the better ones preponderated over the selfish reluctance, and the alms were given voluntarily and deliberately. Let us credit the Christian with giving

preponderant weight to Christian love, zeal for Christ's honor, and the conscientious judgment of obligation. Then these elements of motive have constituted the concrete act a prevalently good one. But there ought to have been no selfish reluctance! Then, the very fact that this evil element was there and even needed suppressing, was an element of moral defect. There, again, was the personal craving for applause, which was enough felt to cause at least a partial disregard of our Savior's rule, Matt. 6:3, "When thou givest alms, let not thy left hand know what they right hand doeth," at the time of giving the alms or afterward. This also detracted from the perfectness of the action. Yet it was a prevalently godly action. So an act may be socially virtuous, while prevalently ungodly; or an act may be wholly godless and vicious. Only those in whom concupiscence has been finally extinguished, perform perfectly godly acts. Such, we repeat, is the analysis of common sense and the Bible. But the Wesleyan acknowledging the remainders of concupiscence in his "complete saint" and yet asserting that his prevalently godly acts are perfect acts, has unconsciously adopted the false Pelagian philosophy in the two points: that (a) "concupiscence in itself is not sinful," and (b) that moral quality resides only in acts of choice. Again, when the Wesleyan says that an act, to which the good man is hurried by a gust of temptation so sudden and violent as to prevent deliberation, an act which is against his prevalent bent and purpose, and which is at once deplored, is an infirmity, but not a sin, he is Pelagianizing. He has virtually made the distinction between mortal and venial sins, which Rome borrows from Pelagius, and he is founding on that heretic's false dogma, that responsibility ends when the will is no longer *in equilibrio.* (in this case it is the sudden gust of temptation which suspends the equilibrium.)

There is also a dangerous affinity between these principles and those horrible deductions from Pelagianism, made by the Jesuits, under the captions of the "Art of Directing the Intention," and "venial sins." The student may see an account of their origin and their refutation in the unrivaled "Provincial Letters" of Blaise Paschal. The general doctrine of Directing the Intention is, that, if in perpetrating a crime the direction of the intention is to the right end, this makes the act right, because the act which is prevalently right is wholly right. The abominations to which this Pelagian dogma led, in the hands of the Jesuits, were such that they contributed to the suspension of their order. It is not charged that the Wesleyans countenanced any of these immoral and loathsome conclusions; but that their premises are dangerous as appears from these results.

(8th) As to the cases of perfection claimed in the Scriptures we reply: Perfection is predicated of these saints to show that they had Christian sincerity, that they had all the graces essential to the Christian character in actual exercise. As if to refute the idea of their sinless perfection or of their living the "Victorious Life"—a life above conscious sin—Scripture, in every case, records of them some fault, drunkenness of Noah, lying of Abraham, adultery and murder of David, unbelief of Zacharias, Luke 1:20, while Job concludes by saying, "I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes." We strengthen the foregoing refutations as follows:

5. *We argue affirmatively that sanctification is never complete in this life* from: (1st) The fact that express declarations of Scripture are contradicted by every theory of Christian perfection in this life—the fact that the Scriptures teach that remains of sin exist in all living men. I Kings 8:45, "There is no man that sinneth not." Prov. 20:9, "Who can say, 'I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin'." Eccles. 7:20, "Surely there is not a righteous man upon the earth, that doeth good and sinneth not." Jas. 3:2, "In many things we all stumble." I John 1:8, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us"—a text of such indubitable meaning that I John 3:9 must be interpreted in accord with it. (2nd) The fact that there is, according to Scripture and Christian experience as recorded in the Scriptures, a perpetual warfare going on between the flesh and the Spirit. Gal. 5:17, "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit and the Spirit against the flesh; for these are contrary the one to the other; that ye may not do the things that ye would." Romans 7:14-24. This warfare, according to the Bible, constitutes the Christian life. "So then I, of myself with the mind (renewed) indeed serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin." It is of no avail for the Wesleyan to attempt to evade this picture of Romans 7:14 *et seq.* as "the language of Paul convicted but not yet converted," which the change of the tense from the past to present with verse 14 forbids; other similar passages remain, e. g. Gal. 5:17 already quoted. Phil. 3:13, 14, "Brethren I count not myself yet to have laid hold: but one thing I do, forgetting the things which are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before, I press on toward the goal unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." I Tim. 6:12, "Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on life eternal, whereunto thou wast called and didst witness the good confession in the sight of many witnesses." The perfect man, David, was conscious of awful sins of life and character. Ps. 51. Moses declares, Ps. 90:12, "Thou hast set our iniquities before thee, our secret

sins in the light of thy countenance." Daniel 9:20, says, "while I was speaking and praying and confessing my sin and the sin of my people Israel, etc." Gal. 2:11, "But when Cephas came to Antioch I resisted him to the face, because he stood condemned." James 5:16, "Confess therefore your sins one to another, and pray one for another that ye may be healed." These Scriptures show decisively that no such thing as entire sanctification was regarded as obtaining in the Apostolic Church, or to be looked for as going to obtain. (3rd) The impossibility of perfect obedience by ransomed men is clearly taught in the Scriptures. Ps. 119:96, "I have seen an end of all perfection: Thy commandment is exceedingly broad." Acts 15:10, "Now therefore why make ye trial of God, that ye should put a yoke on the necks of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." It is true that in Acts 15:10 the ceremonial law is in Peter's mind. The Christian was unable to keep it. Now if it was impossible to keep it perfectly, it would be perfectly impossible for him to keep the moral law. (4th) The Lord's prayer teaches all Christians to pray for forgiveness of sin, a command which would not be universally appropriate if perfectionism were a fact, or should become a fact. (5th) If the experience of Christians subsequent to the ages of inspiration can settle any fact, it teaches that perfectionism is unattainable. For those who are most advanced in sanctification, are most emphatic in their confession of short-comings. The more holy a man is the more self-abhorring, the more sensitive to sin, and the more disposed to cling to Christ he becomes. The moral imperfections which cling to him, he more keenly feels to be sins, and more earnestly laments and strives to overcome. "Believers find that their life is a constant warfare, and that they must take the Kingdom of Heaven by battle—by storm long-protracted." They are always subjected, too, to the constant chastisement of their Father's loving hand, which can only be designed to correct their imperfections, and to confirm their graces." On the other hand those who claim perfect sanctification, usually discredit their pretentions sooner or later, by shameful falls. It is well that the Arminians have coupled the doctrine of falling from grace with this. Otherwise their own professors of complete sanctification would have refuted it with a regularity that would have been almost a fatality. (6th) An argument may be derived from the stimulating influence of our belief toward holiness of life. The Wesleyans are accustomed to claim a more stimulating influence toward the pursuit of holiness, for their doctrine and to reproach ours for paralyzing results: (a) They say that in a rational agent hope is an essential element in the incentive to exertion; and that it is unnatural and impossible a man should attempt in good earnest what he thinks impossible

to be achieved. But tell him that success, though difficult, is possible and he will strain every nerve, and at least make a great progress. (b) They say that Calvinists practically teach their converts not to aim high, and make up their minds to low attainment in holiness; that on this account is the feeble and crippled character of most of the religion exhibited in their churches. We reply: (a) That this accusation misrepresents the facts, and leaves out one of the most important of them. We do not forbid hope. We teach our people to hope for constant advances in holiness, by which they approach perfection continually, without actually reaching it in this life. The essential fact left out of the estimate is the invincible opposition of the new nature to all sin. The man renewed by God is incapabale of contenting himself with any degree of sin. Here is the safe-guard against the cessation of the struggle under the discouraging belief that victory is only after death. If the indwelling sin is thus as long-lived as the body, and to live as long as the body lives, yet truce is impossible because the hostility of the new born soul to it is unquenchable. Does it follow from this view, that the life must be a life-long battle? I reply: Even so: this is just what the Bible represents it as being.

We can bring against the Wesleyan theory a juster objection: By giving a false definition of what perfection is, it incurs a much greater risk of inciting pride, and dragging the conscience into a toleration of what it calls guiltless or venial infirmities. The Bible Christian, the more he is conformed to God, advances just so much the more in tenderness and perspicacity of conscience. Sin grows more odious, just as holiness grows more attractive. Thus, when there is, in God's view, less indwelling sin to extirpate in the heart, the heart is nerved by its contrition to a more determined war against what remains. Thus an ever-progressive sanctification is provided for, conformably to the rational and free nature of man. But our question is: If the Christian be taught what remains of indwelling sin, after a distinctive and decisive reign of grace begins in the soul "is infirmity but not sin," do we not run a terrible risk of encouraging him to rest on the laurels of past attainment; do we not drug his conscience, and do we not thus prepare the way for just those backslidings by which these high pretenders have so frequently signalized their scheme?

Wesleyans sometimes say, that their doctrine of perfect sanctification, as defined by them, amounts to precisely the same with our statement concerning those better Christians, who with Caleb and Joshua (Numbers 14:24) "followed the law fully," and who enjoyed an assurance of their own grace and salvation. Our objection is, that a dangerous and deluding statement is thus made of a Scriptural truth.

All Christians should be urged to these higher spiritual attainments; but they should not be taught to call that "perfection," which is not really perfect, nor to depreciate their remaining sins into mere "infirmities." Perfectionism tends to low views of God's law; low views of the heinousness of sin, a low standard of moral excellence and spiritual pride and fanaticism.

6. While many representatives of the Keswick and Victorious Life theories betray Arminian and Pelagian sympathies; and support their theories for the most part by the same arguments as other perfectionists, this is not true of all of them. The perfectionists now had in mind would vindicate their doctrine by an appeal to certain scriptural passages and to their experiences alone. These advocates of the "Higher Christian Life" say that this stage is reached by those who were before Christians, by a species of second conversion. (In this they are not distinguished from Keswickite Arminians, however.) They say that when a Christian fully entertains a resolve to undertake, in reliance on Christ, a life entirely above sin; a life which shall tolerate no form or grade of shortcoming, and pleads that resolve before God with an entire faith, he receives the corresponding grace and strength, in accordance with the promise: "Ask and ye shall receive." This attainment, they say, is often accompanied with a new "baptism of the Spirit," bestowing this full victory over sin, with a perfect assurance of acceptance; which baptism is immediately and infallibly recognized by the recipient, and, in some cases, is even perceptible to by-standers, by infallible signs. Thence—forward the recipient "walks in the light," enjoys perfect peace, and lives above all sin. It is pleaded by the advocates of this claim, that there is no limit to the Gospel promises, nor to the merits of Christ, nor to the paternal grace of God; that the only reason that we do not get fuller grace, is that we do not believingly ask it: and that no Scriptural limit may be put upon this last proposition, this side of perfect victory over sin. If, say they, men had perfect faith to ask, they would receive of Christ's fulness a perfect answer. They quote such promises as these: Ps. 81:10, "Open thy mouth wide and I will fill it." Matt. 7:8, "Ask and ye shall receive." I Thess. 4:3, "This is the will of God even your sanctification."

That the promises of God in Christ hold out indefinite encouragement to believers, is a precious truth. That it is the duty of all to press forward to the work is indisputable. But when men say that a perfect faith would receive a perfect answer, they are but uttering a valueless truism. The man who had perfect faith would be a perfect man. He would need no more sanctification. Unfortunately for this theory, the indwelling sin which creates the need for further sanctification, inevit-

ably involves some imperfection and weakness of the faith. We shall always have to raise the disciples' cry: "Lord, increase our faith," as long as we cry for increase of grace. So, if a believer's heart were finally, immutably, and perfectly united, through every moment, in the resolve to live by Christ's strength absolutely above sin, he would doubtless meet with no rebuff in any petition for strength, at Christ's throne of grace. But in order to have such a state of purpose, there must be no indwelling sin in the heart. This scheme stripped of its robes, comes therefore to this truism: Were a man absolutely perfect, he would be absolutely perfect?" The picture of the Christian militant life, which we see portrayed in the Scripture is that of an imperfect, but progressive faith uniting him to his Savior, always finding him faithful to his promises, and always deriving from him measures of grace corresponding to the vigor of its exercise, yet always leaving room for farther advances. There is an exceedingly broad and conclusive argument against all forms of perfectionism in this fact: That the provisions of grace described in the Bible are all provisions for imperfect and sinning men. The Gospel is a religion for sinners, and not for perfect saints. This is the only conception of it which appears in any part of the Scripture.

Only a little knowledge and experience are necessary to make us view with suspicion the claims of the spiritual baptism, advanced above. The *immediate visitation* of the Holy Ghost should attest itself by miraculous "signs," by "tongues," or "gifts of healing"; as it did in the Apostolic days. If these be lacking we have no other test of its presence, than the fruit of holy living; and for these we should wait. The Christian, who instead of waiting for this attestation, presumes on an intuitive and infallible consciousness of the endowment, can never Scripturally know but that the impulse he mistakes for the Spirit's baptism is natural fanaticism, or the temptations of him who is able to transform himself into an angel of life.

Now the Almighty Spirit could subdue all sin, in a living saint if he chose. Bible truths certainly present sufficient inducement to act with perfect holiness were our wills completely rectified. Why God does not choose, in any case, to work this complete result in this life, we cannot tell. "Even so, Father, for so it seemeth good in thy sight."

VIII. What the Standard of Our Sanctification? And What the Value and Relation of Christ's Life Thereto?

The standard set for the believer's sanctification is the character of God as expressed in His preceptive law. This rule is perfect and should be sufficient for our guidance; but God in condescension to our weak

and sensuous nature, has also given us an example in the life and character of the Redeemer. That he might serve as an exemplar was a subsidiary but important object of his mission. I Pet. 2:21, "Because Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example, that ye should follow his steps." ("We recognize in its proper place this prophetic function of the Mediator, which the Socinian makes the sole one.")

The advantage of having the law taught by example is obvious: (1) Man is notoriously an imitative creature. Accordingly God availed himself of this powerful lever of education for man's moral culture. (2) Example is superior in perspicuity and interest, possessing all the advantages over precept which illustration has over abstract statement.

If we inspect the example of Christ, we shall find that it has been adjusted to its purpose with a skill and wisdom only inferior to that displayed in his atoning offices. Examining the conditions of an effective example we find that they all concur in Christ. It is desirable that our exemplar be: (1) Human; though holiness in God and in angels is, in principle identical with man's, yet in detail it is too different to be a guide. (2) Yet while it is so desirable that the example be human, it must be perfect; for fallible man would be sure to imitate defects, on an exaggerated scale. (3) Man is naturally out of harmony with holiness, too far to be allured by its example; he would rather be alienated and angered by it. Hence the exemplar must begin by putting forth a regenerating and reconciling agency. (4) Last, it is exceedingly desirable that the examplar be an object of warm affection; because we notice that the imitative instinct always acts for the most part strongly toward one beloved. But Christ is made by his work the prime object of the believer's love.

The value of Christ's example may be also illustrated in the following particulars: (1) It verifies for us the conception of holiness as generally displayed in God. That conception must lack definiteness, until we see it embodied in this "image of the invisible God," who is the brightness of his glory and the express image of His substance." See Lect. VII: End. (2) Next, Christ has illustrated the duties of all ages and stations; for the divine wisdom collected into his brief life all grades, making Him show us a perfect child, youth, man, son, friend, teacher, subject, ruler, king, hero and sufferer. (3) Again, Christ teaches us how common duties are exalted when performed from an elevated motive; for he was earning for His church infinite blessedness, and for His Father eternal glory, when fulfilling the humble tasks of a peasant and mechanic. (4) And last, in his death, especially, he illustrated those duties which are at once hardest and most essential, because attaching to the most critical emergencies of our being, the duties of

forgiveness under wrong, patience and fortitude under anguish, and faith and courage in the hour of death. Rom. 15:3, "For Christ also pleased not himself, but as it is written, The reproaches of them that reproached thee fell upon me." Phil. 2:5, "Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus." Heb. 12:2, 3, "Looking unto Jesus, the author and perfecter of our Faith, who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and hath sat down at the right hand of God the Father." Heb. 3:1, "Consider the Apostle and High Priest of our confession even Jesus." John 3:16: Eph. 4:13, "Till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and to the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." John 13:15; I Cor. 11:1.

Some have endeavored to object that we must not imitate even an incarnate Christ, because he is God and man, and his mediatorial sphere of action is above ours. I reply: Of course we do not presume to imitate his divine acts. But was he not made under our law? One end of this was that he might show us a human perfection, adapted for our imitation.

GOOD WORKS

SYLLABUS

I. Evangelical Good Works Defined According to the Scriptures.

John Dick: Lecture 76.
R. L. Dabney: Theology, pp. 677, 678.
A. A. Hodge: Outlines of Theology, p. 525, 13.
A. A. Hodge: Commentary on the Confession of Faith, Chapter 16, pp. 297-300.
Chas. Hodge: Theology,Part III., Chap. 18, p. 4.

II. Are Any Works of the Natural Man Good Works?

R. L. Dabney, Theology, pp. 678, ff.
A. A. Hodge: Outlines of Theology, p. 525, 15.
A. A. Hodge: Commentary on the Confession of Faith, pp. 309-311.

III. What Are the Different Senses Which Have Been Applied to the Term Merit? The Doctrine of the Romish Church Concerning "Condign" and "Congruous" Merit? What is Necessary That a Work Should Be Called in the Proper Sense Meritorious? Can a Man Merit of God by Good Works? Objections to Our Answer of the Test Question Considered.

R. L. Dabney: Theology, pp. 679-683.
A. A. Hodge: Outlines of Theology, pp. 527-528.
A. A. Hodge: Commentary on the Confession of Faith, pp. 307-309, 310-311.
Confession of Faith, Chapter XVI.

IV. State the Romish Doctrine of Consilia Perfectionis, and Works of Supererogation; and Refute it.

R. L. Dabney: Theology, pp. 684-685.
A. A. Hodge: Commentary on the Confession of Faith, Chapter XVI., pp 4-6, pp. 304-306.
A. A. Hodge: Outlines of Theology, p. 525, 14.

V. Effects and Uses of Gospel Good Works; and the Source of the Ability to do Them?

A. A. Hodge: Outlines of Theology, p. 526, pp. 16, 17.
A. A. Hodge: Commentary on the Confession of Faith, pp. 299-300.

VI. What Do the Scriptures Teach of the Relation of the Good Works of Believers to the Rewards Promised Them?

R. L. Dabney: Theology, p. 683.

A. A. Hodge: Commentary on the Confession of Faith, pp. 309, 3d ff.

GOOD WORKS

I. Evangelical Good Works Defined According to the Scriptures.

There is a gospel sense in which the Scriptures speak of the acts and affections of Christians as good works. By this it is not meant that they are perfect, that they could stand the strictness of the divine judgment, or that they are such as would receive the reward of eternal life under the Covenant of Works. Yet they are essentially different in moral quality from the actings of the unrenewed; and they do express a new and holy nature, as the principle from which they spring. There is also a certain sense in which God rewards and approves them. How are these evangelical actions of the soul defined? We conceive that the Scripture characterizes them as follows: 1. The good work is one whose matter is in accord with God's revealed will. He allows no other rule of right and wrong for the creature. No act of obedience to rules of mere human, ecclesiastical, or secular, devising can claim to be a good work; even if rendered as an act of worship, or service to God, it is an offence to Him. Deut. 4:2, "Ye shall not add unto the word which I commanded you, neither shall ye diminish from it, that ye may keep the commandments of Jehovah your God which I command you." 12:32, "What things soever I command you, that shall ye observe to do: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it." Isa. 1:12, "When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hands, to trample my courts?" Matt. 15:9, "In vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the commandments of men." See also Col. 2:16-23, where will worship is condemned. As God's will is to us practically the fountain of authority and obligation, it is obviously unreasonable that the debtor should decide for the creditor how much or what he should pay the creditor. And moreover, such is the distance between God and man, and the darkness of the sinful mind of man, that man can be no suitable judge of what service it is proper to render God. Man's duty is simply what God requires of him. In defining a good work then, one element in the definition must be conformity to His revealed will in its matter. 2. The good work is one whose prevalent motive, or motives, is holy, i. e. love for God's character, regard for His authority, and zeal for His glory—this love, regard, zeal, not always, it may be consciously felt, yet reigning as a controlling principle of the heart. I Cor. 10:31, "Whether therefore, ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do,

do all to the glory of God." Rom. 11:36, "For of Him and through Him and unto Him, are all things. To him be glory forever. Amen." 12:1, "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your spiritual service." No principle of common sense is plainer than that the quality of the act depends on the quality of the intention. An act not intended to please God, is of course, not pleasing in his sight, no matter how conformed in outward shape to his precepts. 3. Therefore, a good work, done by fallen man, must be from a regenerated soul; because no other can have the disposition to prompt such action and feel such motives as must concur. Matt. 7:17, 18, "Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but the corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." Matt. 12:33, "Either make the tree good, and its fruit good; or make the tree corrupt and its fruit corrupt; for the tree is known by its fruit." Good works, then, are fruits of sanctification and regeneration. "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them" Eph. 2:10. James says that faith is shown by works, which, of course, implies that the kind of works of which he speaks spring only from a believing heart (James 2:18,22).

Such works are not perfectly holy but prevalently holy. I have more than once remarked that the motive of most of our volitions is a complex of several appetencies. Now, this habitual, or present filial regard to God's authority may be the prevalent motive of a given act; and yet it may be short of that fulness and strength which the perfect rectitude and goodness of the heavenly Father deserve. It may also be associated with other lower motives. Of these some may be personal and yet legitimate; as a reasonable subordinate regard to our own proper welfare. The presence of such a motive in the complex would not make the volition sinful. Other motives, however, may and nearly always do, mix with our regard for God, which are not only personal but sinful: either because inordinate or impure, as a craving for applause, or a desire to gratify a spiteful emotion. Remembering the views established in the last lecture, you will perceive that in such a case, the volition would be, on the whole, right and pious, and still short of perfect rightness, or even involving with its holiness a taint of sin.

II. Are Any Works of the Natural Man Good Works?

"Unregenerate men may perform many actions which, for the matter of them are such as God commands, and are of good use both

to themselves and to others. But the best natural virtues of the heathen and all unconverted persons come short of being gospel good works." Gen. 6:5, "And Jehovah saw that the wickedness of men was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." Rom. 8:8, "They that are in the flesh cannot please God." This truth recalls the assertion made of the total depravity of the race, and its grounds. It will be remembered that we did not deny the sincerity of the social virtues, which many pagans and unrenewed men possess. Nor did we represent that their virtues were no better than their vices. What we mean is that, while nearer right than the open vices, they are still short of right; because they lack the essential motive, regard to God's revealed will and the claims of His love. "God is not in all their thoughts." Now, as our relation to God is the nearest and most supreme, an act which ignores this, however right it may be in other motives, still remains prevalently wrong in the sight of God. It does not reach the level of evangelical holiness at all, though it may be much less remote from it than the sins of the reprobate. It is still the act of a rebel. We do not, then, represent God as judging the amiable and decent transgressor equal to a monster of crime, nor condemning all secular virtues as spurious and worthless between man and man, but as regarding him as essentially defective.

III. What Are the Different Senses Which Have Been Applied to the Term Merit? The Doctrine of the Romish Church Concerning "Condign" and "Congruous" Merit? What Is Necessary that a Work Should be Called in the Proper Sense Meritorious? Can a Man Merit of God by Good Works?

1. The word "merit" is used in two different senses: (1) Strictly, to designate the common quality of all services to which a reward is due, in simple justice, on account of their intrincic value and dignity. (2) Loosely, to designate that upon which reward is consequent, without specifying the ground, or virtue, on account of which the reward—approval or something more substantial—is bestowed. Now in this latter sense no one denies that the works of the regenerate are meritorious. They are praiseworthy in a sense. They are followed by a recompense. But in the strict sense, of righteously bringing God into the doer's debt, by their own intrinsic moral value, no human works are meritorious. The chief confusion of thought, then, which is to be cleared away is the confusion between the approvable and the intrinsically meritorious. An act is not intrinsically meritorious merely because it is morally approvable and because some how or other it is followed by reward.

A particular phase of the merit of approvableness has been called "hypothetical merit." It should rather be called the merit of "covenant concession." Under the covenant of works, God graciously promised to reward the obedience of Adam with eternal life. This was a reward, however, not of intrinsic merit, but of free grace and promise. If the king is pleased in his undeserved kindness, to promise the inheritance for the doing of some little service utterly inadequate to the reward, and if any creature complies with the terms exactly, then the king is, of course, bound to give what he has promised. But he is bound, not by commutative justice to the service rendered (for that intrinsically is inadequate), but by the obligation of fidelity. These several kinds of merit may be illustrated by remarking: (1) A regenerate man may merit approval of a sort, and receive the reward of grace. (2) Unfallen Adam was competent to the merit of approvableness, and might have won the merit of covenant concession. (3) Christ won the merit of approvableness, of covenant concession, and intrinsic merit.

2. The proposition that even the good works of believers do not earn eternal life by their intrinsic merit has been found to be very repugnant to human pride. Rome, at this point, as at many others, has hearkened to the voice of the world. She has distinguished between what she calls the *merit of congruity* and the *merit of condignity*. She teaches that the *merit of congruity* is indeed only a qualified kind of merit. She says that it attaches "to those good dispositions or works which a man (according to her) may, previously to regeneration, realize without the aid of divine grace, and which makes it congruous, or specially fitting that God should reward the agent by infusing grace into his heart. She teaches that the *merit of condignity* attached only to works wrought subsequently to regeneration by the aid of divine grace, and that it is of that degree of merit that intrinsically and by its proper value and force entitles the believers to eternal life. True, Bellarmine and the Council of Trent, with the most of the Romanists, say that eternal life comes to the obedient believer partly by the merit of his own works, and partly by virtue of Christ's promise and purchase; so that, were there no Savior, human merit would come short of earning Heaven. But they hold this essentially erroneous idea that, in the gracious works of the justified man, there is a real and intrinsic merit of reward.

3. That a work may be called meritorious in the proper sense it must have the following five traits, according to Turretin: (1) It must be one which was not already owed to God. Luke 17:10, "Even so ye also, when ye shall have done all the things which were commanded

you, say, we are unprofitable servants; we have done that which it is our duty to do." (2) It must be done in the man's own strength, for if he does it only in the strength of Christ, he cannot take to himself the credit of doing it, "It is not he that liveth, but Christ that liveth in him." (3) It must be perfectly and completely right; for if stained with defect it cannot merit. (4) It must be of sufficient importance to bear some equitable ratio to the amount of reward. One would not expect a large sum of money as wages for the momentary act of handing a drink of water, however cheerfully done. (5) It must be of such a sort as to call for the reward of sheer justice.

4. Now: (1) It is plain that *according to this definition, no work of man to God can bring God by its own intrinsic merit into debt to man,* or under an obligation to reward man by increasing his well-being. All our works are owed to God. If all were done, we should only "have done what was our duty to do." No right work is done merely in our own strength. None are perfect. There is no equality between the service of a fleeting life and an inheritance of eternal glory.

(2) We may argue, further, that the *congruous merit of the Papist is imaginary:* (a) Because nothing the unbeliever does can please God. "Without faith it is impossible to please Him." "They that are in the flesh cannot please God." Every man is under condemnation until he believes on Christ with living faith; but if a person is under condemnation, none of his acts can merit. (b) There is an irreconcilable contrast between grace and meritorious works. Rom. 11:6, "But if it is by grace, it is no more of works: Otherwise grace is no more grace." The two are mutually exclusive, and cannot be combined. Grace is undeserved bestowal—reward without works; merit purchases by its desert. This being so, it is vain for the Papist to attempt to excuse his error of a congruous merit subordinated to, and dependent on, free grace, by any false analogies of first and second causes. The human affection or acts springing out of grace, may have approvableness, but not intrinsic merit. Moreover the Papist should be informed that *congruous merit,* as he defines it belongs to a work done by an agent prior to that agent's having been made the subject of a quickening grace. That grace cannot be thought of, therefore, as having a casual relation to the act of congruous merit, unless it be mere common grace —not efficacious.

The practical remark should also be made here, that when the awakened sinner is thus encouraged to claim saving grace as due to the *congruous* merit of his strivings, tears, reformations, or sacraments, he is put in the greatest peril of mistaking the way of salvation, grieving

the Spirit, and falling into a fatal self-righteousness. What more insolent and deadly mistake can be made than this telling of God, on the part of a miserable sinner, pensioners on his mere mercy, that the wretch's carnal, selfish striving, or expedients, have brought the Almighty into his debt, in a sense, to bestow saving help? (3) The whole Scripture holds forth the truth, that Christ bestows saving graces, not because of any form of merit, but notwithstanding utter demerit. We receive them "without money and without price." It was "when we were enemies, that we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son." Even the saint seeking grace always, in the Scripture, seeks it purely of grace. Much more must the sinner. Ps. 51:1-4, "have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy loving kindness. According to the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out my transgressions. Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin. For I know my transgression, and my sin is ever before me. Against Thee, Thee only have I sinned, and done that which is evil in thy sight, that thou mayst be justified when thou speakest, and clear when Thou judgest." Dan. 9:18, "My God encline Thine ear and hear: open thine eyes and behold our desolation, and the city which is called by thy name. For we do not present our supplications before Thee for our righteousness, but for thy great mercy's sake." I Tim, 1:12-16. In conclusion of this point, it will be instructive to notice the close connection between this claim of "congruous merit" and the value attached by those Protestants who are synergists, to the expedients which they devise to prepare the way for faith. Awakened sinners are encouraged to use them, and to look to them, not indeed as justifying; but as somehow leading on to more saving graces.

It may indeed be granted that there is a certain relationship of sequence between the exercisings and strivings of carnal conviction and saving conversion. "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that be sick." The pangs of the sick man have a certain instrumentality in prompting him to send for the physician who cures him. In this sense they may be viewed as useful. But *per se,* they are not in the least degree curative; they are but parts of the disease, whose only tendency is death. If they have not the merit of congruity, much less have they the merit of condignity.

(3) That *no merit of condignity attaches even to the good works of saints,* IS CLEAR FROM the conditions we have shown to be requisite (See p. 4). The most conclusive passages are such as these. Luke 17:9, 10. "Doth he thank the servant because he did the things that were commanded. Even so ye also, when ye shall have done all

the things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants. We have done that which it was our duty to do." II Tim. 1:9, "Who saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before times eternal." Titus 3:5, "Not by works done in righteousness which we did ourselves, but according to his mercy he saved us, through the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit." Ephesians 2:8-10, "For by grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God: not of works, that no man should glory. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God afore prepared that we should walk in them." Rom. 6:23, "For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 5:15-18, "The first passage (Luke 17:9-10) gives an argument by analogy, founded on the Judean husbandman's relation to his bond servant (his δοῦλ not his hireling). The master had legitimate property in his labor and industry—not in his moral personality, which belonged inalienably to God. Hence, when the bondsman rendered that service, the master did not for a moment think that he was thereby pecuniarily indebted to him for a labor which was already his own property: however he might regard the docility and fidelity of the bondsman highly approvable, he never dreamed that he owed him wages therefor. So we are God's property. He has, at the outset of our transacting with him, ownership in all our services. Hence, if we even served him perfectly (which we never do), we could not claim that we had paid God any overplus of our dues, or brought him into our debt. He might approve our fidelity but he would owe us no wages. In Romans 6:23, the apostle actually breaks the symmetry of his antithesis, in order to teach that we merit nothing of his commutative justice. Death is the wages which sin *earns;* but eternal life is the *gift* of God, and not wages earned by the Christian. The remaining passages teach the same.

(4) *Turretin sustains this view, further, by showing that the gracious acts, for which Romanists claim merit of condignity* AND THE ETERNAL life attached to them, are always spoken of as the Father's gifts; that they are always spoken of as the redeemer's purchase; that the Christians who do them are represented in the Bible as acknowledging themselves "unprofitable servants"; and that they always confess the unworthiness of their best works, especially in view of the everlasting reward. The Scriptures which might be collected under these heads would present an overwhelming array of proof.

(5) *To the position just established that man cannot bring God into debt to him by the intrinsic value of his services, carnal men strongly object:*

(a) Some of them urge as if it were a self-evident refutation, that as sin and good works are in antithesis, we cannot hold that man's sin holds a true and essential desert of punishment, and deny that his good work carries an equal desert of reward. To affix the one and refuse the other, they exclaim, would be a flagrant injustice.

I reply: Between human rulers and ruled, it would; but they forget the prime fact, that God is the maker and sovereign proprietor of men. The property may be delinquent towards its sovereign owner, but it cannot make the owner delinquent to it. If it fails in due service, it injures the rights of its owner: if it renders the service, it only satisfies those rights; nothing more. Here, however, a certain concession should be made. While a creature's perfect obedience is not meritorious of any claim of reward, upon his Lord, in the strict sense, there is a relation of moral propriety between such obedience and reward. We saw that it was unreasonable to claim everlasting reward for temporal service. But does not a perfect temporal service deserve of God temporal reward? In a certain sense, Yes; supposing the creature in a state of innocency and harmony with his Lord. That is God cannot penalize the perfect man; the perfect man deserves that he be not penalized. It would be inconsistent with God's benevolence and with his rectitude, with his justice, to begin to visit on this innocent creature the evils due to sin before he sinned. God would not infringe by any suffering or wrath, that natural blessedness, with which his own holiness and goodness always leads him to endow the state of innocency. But here the obligation is chiefly to God's own perfections, rather than to the creature's merit.

(b) Some have supposed these views to be inconsistent with the terms of the Covenant of Works between God and the elect angels, and God and Adam. They say that Paul, Rom. 4:4, 5 ("Now to him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned as of grace, but as of debt; but to him that worketh not but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is reckoned for righteousness"), and Rom. 11:6 ("But if it is by grace it is no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace"), in drawing the contrast already cited between works and grace, assigns condign merit to a perfect service done under the Covenant of Works. To him that worketh is the reward reckoned not of grace, but of debt.

I reply: No; the merit achieveable under the Covenant of Works was not condign merit but the merit of Covenant Concession. When once God has gratuitously condescended to promise, a claim of right for perfect service rendered may emerge, of course. It emerges out of God's fidelity, not out of commutative justice. And when the creature, as Gabriel, for instance, complies with the covenant terms perfectly, he gets his reward on different terms from those of the pardoned sinner. He gets it by works of his own. He in virtue of a gracious compact, earns, in a sense, his reward. As the believer can never earn his reward, since all his Christian works are defective and in themselves worthy to be condemned, the contrast between the way Adam might have won life and the way in which alone the sinner must receive it, is sufficient to justify amply the Apostle's language. To overthrow our position the objectors should point not to a case in which the merit of Covenant Concession was achieved but to a case in which intrinsic merit has been won, by a mere creature.

IV. State the Romish Doctrine of Consilia Perfectionis and Works of Supererogation.

It may be said that the Romish Church is indebted to the age of Thomas Aquinas, and most probably to him, for the final theory of the "works of supererogation." He found among the Fathers the distinction between Christ's praecepta and consilia. This distinction pretending to find its grounds in certain texts of the New Testament, more probably had its origin in a desire to imitate the esoteric and the exoteric, higher and lower morals of the New Platonists. The instances of the so-called consilia usually quoted are: Matt. 19:12, 21. "For there are eunuchs, that were so born from their mother's womb, and there are eunuchs that made themselves enunchs for the Kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it." "Jesus said unto him, If thou wouldst be perfect, go, sell that which thou hast, and give it to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come and follow me." I Cor. 7:38-40, "So then both he that giveth his own virgin daughter in marriage doeth well; and he that giveth her not in marriage shall do better. A wife is bound for so long time as her husband liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is free to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord. But she is happier if she abide as she is, after my judgment; and I think that I also have the Spirit of God." Acts 21:23, "Do therefore this that we say to thee. We have four men that have a vow on them. These take, and purify thyself with them, and be at charges for them, that they may shave their heads and all shall know

that there is no truth in the things whereof they have been informed concerning thee; but that thou thyself also walkest orderly, keeping the law." These "counsels" are usually grouped by them under three heads, as counsels to voluntary poverty, to perpetual chastity, and to obedience to some (monastic) rule. The Church had long held that while everyone must strive to obey all the precepts of Christ, on pain of damnation, he is not expressly bound to comply with the "counsels of perfection." If he sees fit to omit them he incurs no wrath. They are but recommendations. Yet if his devoted spirit impels him to keep them for the glory of God, he thereby earns supererogatory merit, superfluous to his own justification. Aquinas proceeded to build upon this foundation as follows: One man can work a supererogatory righteousness, either penal or preceptive, which righteousness may be imputed to another. He asks What else is the meaning of Gal. 6:2, "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ." He argues that "Among men, one man's generous efforts are permitted in a thousand ways to avail for another, as in suretyships. But with God love avails far more than with men." Yes, a less penance is a satisfaction for a brother's guilt than would be requisite for one's own, in the case of equal sin. Because the purer disinterestedness, displayed in atoning for the penitential guilt of a brother, renders it more amiable in the sight of God, and so more expiatory. If a sinning believer hits himself twenty blows with his whip on his bare shoulders, it may be that a selfish fear of purgatory is a large part of his motive; and God will subtract from the merit of the act accordingly. But when he does it for his brother's sin, it is pure disinterested love and zeal for God's honor, and the twenty blows will count for more.

The philosopher then resorts to the doctrine of the unity of the Church and the Communion of Saints in each other's graces and sufferings, and to the doctrine, developed by Alexander of Hales, that there is in the Roman Catholic Church a treasury of merits, consisting of the merits of Christ and the canonized saints into which all supererogatory merit flows; to show that the merit of these supererogatory services and sufferings is imputed to others. As the priesthood hold the power of the keys, they of course are the persons to dispense and apply it. But as the unity of the Church is especially represented in its earthly head, the Pope, he is especially the proper person to have charge of the Treasury. Accordingly this is the way an indulgence is procured, viz. the Pope imputes some of this supererogatory merit of works and penance out of the Church treasury, whence the remission to the culprit of the penitential and purgatorial satisfaction due from him for sin. But his confession, contrition, and absolution are necessary, otherwise

a man's own personal penance would have done no good. Last, this indulgence may properly be given by the Church, in return for money, provided it be directed to a holy use, as repairing churches, building monasteries, etc. (He forgot our Savior's words: "Freely ye have received, freely give.")

The overthorw of all this artificial structure is very easy for the Protestant:

1st. We utterly deny the distinction of the pretended "counsels of perfection," from the precepts, as wicked and senseless. It is impossible that it can hold: Because we are told that the precepts go to this extent, viz. requiring us to love God with all our soul, and heart and mind and strength. If then, any Christian has indeed found out that his circumstances are such that the refraining from a given act, before and elsewhere indifferent, has become necessary to Christ's highest glory, then for him it is obligatory and no longer optional. "To him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not to him it is sin." Rome's instances of counsels to perfection are not counsels to "perfection" but are embraced by the precepts. See Matt. 19:23, 24: "And Jesus said unto his disciples, Verily I say unto you, It is hard for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven. And again I say unto you, it is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." The rich ruler incurs, by rejecting our Savior's counsel, not loss of supererogatory merit, but the loss of heaven!

2nd. How can he have a superfluity, who lacks enough for himself? But all lack righteousness for their own justification; for "in many things we all stumble." So the Scriptures utterly repudiate the notion that the righteousness of one man is imputable to another. Christian fellowship carries no such result. It was necessary (for reasons unfolded in discussing the Mediator), that God should effectuate the miracle of the hypostatic union, in order to having a person whose merit was imputable. "None of them (mere men) can by any means redeem his brother, or give to God a ransom for him."

3rd. The Protestant does not recognize the existence of that "temporal guilt" which Rome professes to be paid in Purgatory.

4th. The doing of that which God has not made man's duty—all manner of will-worship and commandments of men—God declares is an abomination to him. Matt. 15:9, "In vain do they worship me teaching for their doctrine the commandments of men." I Tim. 4:3, Col. 2:18-22.

5th. The working of the Romish system of celibacy has produced fruits that prove the principle upon which it rests to be radically immoral and false.

V. The Effects and Uses of Good Works; and the Source of the Ability to do Them.

The effects and uses of good works are many:

1st. They express the gratitude and manifest the graces of God in the believer, and so adorn the profession of the gospel. Faith works by love (Gal. 6:5). Christ bids us express our love for him by keeping his commandments. John 14:15, 23, "If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments." "Jesus answered and said unto him: If a man love me, he will keep my word, and my Father will love him; and we will come unto him and make our abode with him."

2nd. They glorify God. Since He is their author (Eph. 2:10) "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God afore prepared that we should walk in them," they manifest the excellence of his grace and are fitted to excite all who behold them to appreciate and proclaim his glory. Matt. 5:16, "Even so let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven." I Pet. 2:12, "Having your behavior seemly among the gentiles, that wherein they speak against you as evil doers, they may by your good works which they behold, glorify God in the day of visitation."

3rd. As good works spring from grace, so the production of them developes the grace through evoking its exercise, and the assurance of our own gracious state increases with the strength and evidences of the graces whence good works flow.

4th. They edify the body of Christ by evidencing the truth and power of Christianity and of divine grace; and by the force of example lead others to doing them. I Thess. 1:7, "So that ye become an ensample to all that believe in Macedonia and Achaia." I Tim. 4:12, "Be thou an ensample to them that believe, in word, in manner of life, in love, in faith, in purity." I Pet. 5:3.

5th. Good works disprove and render impotent the opposition of the wicked. I Pet. 2:15, "For so is the will of God, that by well-doing ye should put to silence the ignorance of foolish men."

6th. They are necessary to the attainment of salvation, not in any sense as a prerequisite to justification, nor as ever, in the course of the believer's life, meriting salvation; but as essential elements of that

SPENCE LIBRARY
Union Theological Seminary
RICHMOND, VA.

salvation, as that whereunto a man must be saved in part. A saved soul is a holy soul, and a holy soul is one whose faculties are engaged in works of loving obedience. Grace in the heart will express itself in good works in the life.

(For a fuller discussion of the necessity of good works, see Lecture on Justification. Dabney, pp. 646-647.)

VI. What do the Scriptures Teach of the Relation of the Good Works of Believers to the Rewards Promised Them?

The real ground of the believer's reward is the achieved righteousness of Christ. He kept the precepts of the law for every true believer. He paid the penal debt due each true believer. He wrought an imputable righteousness with which the sinner is clothed. On account of this righteousness the sinner is rewarded. The believer's reward is not that of "covenant concession," such as unfallen Adam might have won. Adam could have complied perfectly with the terms of the covenant of works and so won life under the terms of that covenant, but the believer is competent to no perfect compliance with the terms of the gospel covenant. He receives his reward in the world to come as a gracious gift for Christ's sake. However, the good works are to be followed by gifts of grace proportioned to the grace given and appropriated in this life. These future gifts of grace are called rewards: 1st. That like rewards, they may act upon us as inducement to diligent obedience. 2nd. That it may appear that the gifts of heaven and blessedness are acts of strict justice: (1) as regards the merit of Christ, (2) as regards God's adherance to his own free promise. 3rd. To show that the heavenly blessedness stands in a certain gracious proportion to obedience on earth, because God so wills. Matt. 16:21, "Then shall he render unto every man according to his deeds," because the grace given on earth prepares the soul to receive the grace given in heaven. II Cor. 4:17, "For our light affliction which is for a moment worketh for us more and more exceedingly an eternal weight of glory."